

# SPEECHES <sup>and</sup> STATEMENTS of



*Ighal*

# SPEECHES AND STATEMENTS OF IQBAL

*Compiled by*  
" SHAMLOO "

AL-MANAR ACADEMY  
LAHORE (PAK.)

*Published*

First Edition	....	....	March 1945
Second Enlarged Edition	...		September 1948

## PREFACE

Among the literary remains of the late Allama Sir Muhammad Iqbal are two addresses, some speeches delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council and a number of Press statements on current topics which lie scattered in small pamphlets, Proceedings of the Punjab Legislative Council and old files of newspapers. There was a great risk of their getting lost and the compiler has collected them in the present volume in the hope that lovers of Iqbal will welcome them in this form.

Iqbal was not a prolific speaker or writer. He spoke from the public platform but rarely and his Press statements are also not many. He spoke only when he had something weighty to say and for this reason his utterances, though delivered in response to current demands, possess a perennial interest.

Iqbal was not a politician. Indeed, he has confessed his inability to be one. His mind was incapable of the intrigues, trickeries and machinations, which constitute the mental and moral equipment of the common run of politicians. First and foremost, he was a student of Islam. As a matter of fact, that was the chief occupation of his life. "I have given the best part of my life," he says in his address delivered at the annual session of the All-India Muslim League, "to a careful study of Islam, its law and polity, its culture, its history and its civilization." Now, Islam is not a

cult. It is a whole philosophy of life and political philosophy is an essential and indispensable part of it. He could not, therefore, avoid being a political thinker as well. Indeed, it is his special merit, which distinguishes him from most other Muslim thinkers in history, that he took a comprehensive and sympathetic view of Islam and treated it as a completely integrated unity. He had the vision to see that "politics have their roots in the spiritual life of man," and that "religion is a power of the utmost importance in the life of individuals as well as nations." At a time when everybody in India and abroad was shouting himself hoarse to prove in his own way that religion must be kept apart from politics, the Allama had the courage to declare that separation of religion and politics was the greatest misfortune of man and that it was the divorce between the two which was threatening to destroy the whole superstructure of civilization.

Profoundly interested as he was in Islam and its principles as the one factor of stability in a world which seems to have lost its moorings, the Allama kept a keen watch on all political, religious and cultural movements of the day. Says he :- "It is because present-day political ideals, as they appear to be shaping themselves in India, may affect its (Islam's) original structure and character that I find myself interested in politics."

Realizing, as he did, the intimate relationship between spiritual life and mundane life, the Allama depicted the political thought of the Indian Muslims thus : "The Indian Muslim has long since ceased to

explore the depths of his inner life. The result is that he has ceased to live in the full glow and colour of life and is consequent in danger of an unmanly compromise with forces which, he is made to think, he cannot vanquish in open conflict." Considerable change has since come over the Indian Muslims through the Muslim League movement. But before 1937, which may be said to be the year of the awakening of the Indian Muslims, the politics of the Muslims of India could only be called one of unmanly compromise. A body among us frankly believed that safety lay only in British protection, while those who considered themselves advanced sought safety in compromise with—or rather surrender to—the Hindu majority as represented by the Indian National Congress. Those, on the other hand who stood uncompromisingly for the integrity of muslims as a nation in their own right with their own cultural and political ideals were a very small group indeed, and the Allama's thought was their hope and their consolation.

But what the Allama says about exploring the depths of inner life stands almost as true today as it did then, and the suggestion he then made for remedying the defect is one that deserves serious consideration at the hands of all educated Muslims. The Allama suggested "the establishment of male female cultural institutes in all the big towns of India. These institutes as such should have nothing to do with politics. Their chief function should be to mobilize the dormant spiritual energy of the

younger generation by giving them a clear grasp of what Islam has already achieved and what it has still to achieve in the religious and cultural history of mankind. The progressive forces of a people can be roused only by placing before them a new task calculated to enlarge the individual and to make him comprehend and experience the community, not as a heap of isolated fragments of life but as a well-defined whole possessing inner cohesion and solidarity. And when once these forces are roused, they bring fresh vigour for new conflicts and that sense of inner freedom which enjoys resistance and hold out the promise of a new self."

Politicians are apt to trim their sails to the winds that may be blowing at particular time. This is particularly the case with the majority of Muslim leaders in India who are the product of an age when the Indian Muslim had no politics except that of compromise with the British or the Congress had had no consciousness whatsoever of their own national identity and so long as leadership of the community remains in the hands of such persons, Muslim interests will be always in jeopardy. The nation will be safe only when the common mass of the people becomes sufficiently enlightened and organised to take their destiny in their own hands and the most effective way of bringing about such an enlightenment is the establishment of what the Allama called cultural institutes.

Also, the politician is apt to regard the acquisition of political power as an end in itself, and there must

be many among our politicians to whom Pakistan signifies nothing more than a means of escape from Hindu domination. It is sheer fear of the majority community in India or perhaps hope of some material gain for the Muslims, that determines their political policies. Saturated as his whole thought was with the spirit of Islam, neither power nor material gain had any attraction for Iqbal. He demanded the establishment of a separate sovereign Muslim state in north-west India, not as an escape from Hindu domination, but in order that Muslims might be able to live a truly Islamic life and establish an ideal society. According to the Allama, such a sovereign state would furnish an opportunity for Islam "to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilize its law, education, its culture, and to bring them into closer contact with its original spirit and with the spirit of modern times." Of course there is conflict between the policy of the League and Iqbal's ideal so far as Pakistan ideology is concerned. The Allama lays down an ideal and points out the ultimate purposes which the sovereign state of Pakistan will seek to serve while the Muslim League's objective is the establishment of the state itself, without which those ultimate purposes cannot possibly be attained. Given the state, it will be upto the Muslims, if they believe in Islam and its purposes, to utilize the state for the realization of those purposes. In fact Muslim thought through out India is already running in that direction.



It is not the compiler's object to review in this Preface the whole thought-content of the speeches and statements included in this volume. The object of these lines is only to point out that these speeches and statements contain matter of great political and cultural importance to the Muslims of India which would be a source of guidance to them in their political struggles today and in their endeavours for their cultural and spiritual uplift for a long time to come. Iqbal stands in the front rank of Muslim thinkers of all times and the Indian Muslims cannot at this juncture afford to ignore or lose sight of anything that the great sage has said.

A number of footnotes have been added by the compiler which will, no doubt, help the reader in understanding the text better. The compiler's thanks are due to a number of friends and others who have helped in collecting the speeches and statements of the great Muslim thinker.

For the benefit of those who are not familiar with English, an Urdu edition of this volume is being published simultaneously.

Lahore :

“ SHAMLOO ”

12th May 1944.

# CONTENTS

## PART ONE

### ADDRESSES AND SPEECHES

I	Presidential address delivered at the annual session of the All-India Muslim League at Allahabad on the 29th December, 1930	...	3
II	Presidential address delivered at the annual session of the All-India Muslim Conference at Lahore on the 21st March, 1932	...	36
III	Speech on the Budget, 1927-28, delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 5th march, 1927	... ..	61
IV	Speech on the cut motion on Government's demand for grant under 'Education' delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 10th March, 1927	... ..	64
V	Speech on the motion for adjournment regarding communal riots delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 18th July, 1927	...	67
VI	Speech on the resolution regarding filling of post by open competitive examination delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 19th July, 1927	... ..	69
VII	Speech on the resolution regarding Unani and Ayurvedic systems of medicine delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 22nd February, 1928	... ..	73
VIII	Speech on the resolution regarding application of the principles of assessment of income-tax to the assessment of land revenue delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 23rd February, 1928	... ..	75

IX	Speech on the Budget, 1929-30 delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 4th March, 1929	...	...	...	81
X	Speech on the Budget, 1930-31 delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 7th March, 1930	...	...	...	85

## PART TWO

### ISLAM AND QADIANISM

I	Qadianis and Orthodox Muslims	...	...	93
II	Rejoinder to the "Light"	...	...	161
III	A letter to the "statesman."	...	...	107
IV	Reply to Questions raised by Pandit J. L. Nehru			111
V	Mc Taggart's philosophy			144
VI	Some study Notes			156

## PART THREE

### MISCELLANEOUS STATEMENTS

I	Letter of resignation of the office of Secretary of the All-India Muslim League, published on the 24th June, 1928	...	...	163
II	Extracts from a letter to Sir Francis Yongehusband, published in the "Civil and Military Gazette" on the 30th July, 1931	...	...	164
III	Statement on his impressions of World Muslim Congress, published on the 1st January 1932			170
IV	Statement on the Report of the Indian Franchise Committee, published on the 5th June, 1932			171
V	Statement explaining the postponement of the meeting of the Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference, issued on the 29th June, 1932	...	...	171
VI	Statement further explaining the postponement of the meeting of the Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference, issued on the 6th July, 1932	...	...	172

VII	Statement on the reported split in the All-India Muslim Conference, issued on the 25th July, 1932	... ..	175
VIII	Statement on the Sikh demands, issued on the 25th July, 1932	... ..	176
IX	Statement on Sir Jogendra Singh's proposal for Sikh-Muslim negotiations, published on the 4th August, 1932	... ..	178
X	Statement explaining the resolution passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim Conference regarding Sikh-Muslim Conversation, issued on the 10th August, 1932	... ..	180
XI	Statement on the Communal Award, issued on the 24th August, 1932	... ..	182
XII	Statement on the Lucknow Conference of Nationalist Muslim leaders, issued on the 8th October, 1932	... ..	185
XIII	Statement on the resolution passed at the Lucknow Conference, of Nationalist Muslim leaders issued, on the 17th October, 1932	... ..	187
XIV	Statement on the constitution emerging from the Round Table Conference, issued on the 26th February, 1933	... ..	188
XV	Statement on the conditions prevailing in Europe, issued on the 26th February, 1933	... ..	189
XVI	Statement on the constitution outline in the White Paper, issued on the 20th March, 1933	... ..	190
XVII	Statement on the rebellion in Chinese Turkestan published on the 16th May, 1933	... ..	192
XVIII	Statement on the disturbances in Kashmir State, issued on the 7th June, 1933	... ..	193
XIX	Statement on his resignation of the office of President of the All-India Kashmir Committee, issued on the 20th June, 1933	... ..	197

XX	Statement on his rejection of the office of pre- sidentship of the "Tehrik-i-Kashmir", issued on the 22nd October, 1933	200
XXI	Statement on the administrative reforms in Kashmir, issued on the 3rd August, 1933	201
XXII	Statement on the "Punjab communal formula", issued on the 14th July, 1933	202
XXIII	Statement explaining Sir Fazl-i-Husain's ob- servation in the council of State regarding Pan-Islamism, issued on the 19th September, 1933	204
XXIV	Statement on the proposed Afghan University, published on the 19th October, 1933	205
XXV	Statement on the conditions in Afghanistan, issued on the 6th November, 1933	206
XXVI	Statement explaining the attitude of Muslim delegates to the Round Table Conference, issued on the 6th December, 1933	208
XXVII	Statement explaining the Congress attitude to- wards the Communal Award, issued on the 19th June, 1934	212
XXVIII	Letter dated 20th July, 1937 to Miss Ferguson giving his views on the Palestine Report	213
XXIX	Statement on the Report recommending the parti- tion of Palestine read at a public meeting held under the auspices of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League at Lahore on the 27th July, 1937	215
XXX	Letter dated 6th September 1937 to Miss Ferguson on the subject of Palestine	218
XXXI	Statement urging the creation of a chair for Islamic research, published on the 10th December,	219
XXXII	New Year's message broadcast from the Lahore Station of the All-India Radio on the 1st January, 1938	220
XXXIII	Statement on Islam and Nationalism in reply to a statement of Maulana Husain Ahmed, published in the "Ehsan" on the 9th March, 1938	223

**PART I**

**ADDRESSES AND SPEECHES**

Patriotism is a perfectly natural virtue and has place in the moral life of man. Yet that which really matters is a man's faith, his culture, his historical tradition. These are the things which in my eyes are worth living for and dying for, and not the piece of earth with which the spirit of man happens to be temporarily associated.

*Presidential address delivered at the annual session of the All-India Muslim League at Allahabad on the 29th December, 1930.*

Gentlemen, I am deeply grateful to you for the honour you have conferred upon me in inviting me to preside over the deliberations of the All-India Muslim League at one of the most critical moments in the history of Muslim political thought and activity in India. I have no doubt that in this great assembly there are men whose political experience is far more extensive than mine, and for whose knowledge of affairs I have the highest respect. It will, therefore, be presumptuous on my part to claim to guide an assembly of such men in the political decisions which they are called upon to make today. I lead no party; I follow no leader. I have given the best part of my life to a careful study of Islam, its law and polity, its culture, its history and its literature. This constant contact with the spirit of Islam, as it unfolds itself in time, has, I think, given me a kind of insight into its significance as a world-fact. It is in the light of this insight, whatever its value, that, while assuming that the Muslims of India are determined to remain true to the spirit of Islam, I propose not to guide you in your decisions but to attempt the humbler task of bringing clearly to your consciousness the main principle which, in my opinion, should determine the general character of these decisions.

It cannot be denied that Islam, regarded as an ethical ideal plus a certain kind of polity—by which



expression I mean a social structure regulated by a legal system and animated by a specific ethical ideal—has been the chief formative factor in the life-history of the Muslims of India. It has furnished those basic emotions and loyalties which gradually unify scattered individuals and groups and finally transform them into a well-defined people. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that India is perhaps the only country in the world where Islam, as a people-building force, has worked at its best. In India, as elsewhere, the structure of Islam as a society is almost entirely due to the working of Islam as a culture inspired by a specific ethical ideal. What I mean to say is that Muslim society, with its remarkable homogeneity and inner unity, has grown to be what it is under the pressure of the laws and institutions associated with the culture of Islam. The ideas set free by European political thinking, however, are now rapidly changing the outlook of the present generation of Muslims both in India and outside India. Our younger men, inspired by these ideas, are anxious to see them as living forces in their own countries without any critical appreciation of the facts which have determined their evolution in Europe. In Europe Christianity was understood to be a purely monastic order which gradually developed into a vast church-organisation. The protest of Luther was directed against this church-organisation, not against any system of polity of a secular nature, for the obvious reason that there was no such polity associated with Christianity. And Luther was perfectly justified in rising in revolt against this organisation; though, I think, he did not realise that in the peculiar conditions which

obtained in Europe, his revolt would eventually mean the complete displacement of the universal ethics of Jesus by the growth of a plurality of national and hence narrower systems of ethics. Thus the upshot of the intellectual movement initiated by such men as Rousseau and Luther was the break-up of the one into mutually ill-adjusted many, the transformation of a human into a national outlook, requiring a more realistic foundation, such as the notion of country, and finding expression through varying systems of polity evolved on national lines, i.e., on lines which recognise territory as the only principle of political solidarity. If you begin with the conception of religion as complete other-worldliness, then what has happened to Christianity in Europe is perfectly natural. The universal ethics of Jesus is displaced by national systems of ethics and polity. The conclusion to which Europe is consequently driven is that religion is a private affair of the individual and has nothing to do with what is called man's temporal life. Islam does not <sup>dissect into</sup> bifurcate the unity of man into an irreconcilable duality of spirit and matter. In Islam God and the universe, spirit and matter, church and state, are organic to each other. Man is not the citizen of a profane world to be renounced in the interest of a world of spirit situated elsewhere. To Islam matter is spirit realising itself in space and time. Europe uncritically accepted the duality of spirit and matter probably from Manichæan thought. Her best thinkers are realising this initial mistake today, but her statesmen are indirectly forcing the world to accept it as an unquestionable dogma. It is, then, this mistaken separation

of spiritual and temporal which has largely influenced European religious and political thought and has resulted practically in the total exclusion of Christianity from the life of European states. The result is a set of mutually ill-adjusted states dominated by interests not human but national. And these mutually ill-adjusted states after trampling over the morals and convictions of Christianity, are today feeling the need of a federated Europe, *i.e.*, the need of a unity which Christian church-organisation originally gave them, but which, instead of reconstructing it in the light of Christ's mission of human brotherhood, they considered it fit to destroy under the inspiration of Luther. A Luther in the world of Islam, however, is an impossible phenomenon; for here there is no church-organisation similar to that of Christianity in the Middle Ages, inviting a destroyer. In the world of Islam we have a universal polity whose fundamentals are believed to have been revealed, but whose structure, owing to our legists' want of contact with modern world, stands today in need of renewed power by fresh adjustments. I do not know what will be the final fate of the national idea in the world of Islam. Whether Islam will assimilate and transform it, as it has assimilated and transformed before many ideas expressive of different spirits, or allow a radical transformation of its own structure by the force of this idea, is hard to predict. Professor Wensinck of Leiden (Holland) wrote to me the other day: "It seems to me that Islam is entering upon a crisis through which Christianity has been passing for more than a century. The great difficulty is how to save the foundations of religion when many antiquated

notions have to be given up. It seems to me scarcely possible to state what the outcome will be for Christianity, still less what it will be for Islam. At the present moment the national idea is racialising the outlook of Muslims, and thus materially counteracting the humanising work of Islam. And the growth of racial consciousness may mean the growth of standards different and even opposed to the standards of Islam."

I hope you will pardon me for this apparently academic discussion. To address this session of the All-India Muslim League you have selected a man who is not despaired of Islam as a living force for freeing the outlook of man from its geographical limitations, who believes that religion is a power of the utmost importance in the life of individuals as well as states, and finally who believes that Islam is itself destiny and will not suffer a destiny. Such a man cannot but look at matters from his own point of view. Do not think that the problem I am indicating is a purely theoretical one. It is a very living and practical problem calculated to affect the very fabric of Islam as a system of life and conduct. On a proper solution of it alone depends your future as a distinct cultural unit in India. Never in our history has Islam had to stand a greater trial than the one which confronts it today. It is open to a people to modify, reinterpret or reject the foundational principles of their social structure, but it is absolutely necessary for them to see clearly what they are doing before they undertake to try a fresh experiment. Nor should the way in which I am approaching this important

problem lead anybody to think that I intend to quarrel with those who happen to think differently. You are a Muslim assembly and, I suppose, anxious to remain true to the spirit and ideal of Islam. My sole desire, therefore, is to tell you frankly what I honestly believe to be the truth about the present situation. In this way alone it is possible for me to illuminate, according to my light, the avenues of your political action.

What, then, is the problem and its implications? Is religion a private affair? Would you like to see Islam, as a moral and political ideal, meeting the same fate in the world of Islam as Christianity has already met in Europe? Is it possible to retain Islam as an ethical ideal and to reject it as a polity in favour of national politics, in which religious attitude is not permitted to play any part? This question becomes of special importance in India where the Muslims happen to be in a minority. The proposition that religion is a private individual experience is not surprising on the lips of a European. In Europe the conception of Christianity as a monastic order, renouncing the world of matter and fixing its gaze entirely on the world of spirit led, by a logical process of thought, to the view embodied in this proposition. The nature of the Prophet's religious experience, as disclosed in the Quran, however, is wholly different. It is not mere experience in the sense of a purely biological event, happening inside the experient and necessitating no reactions on his social environment. It is individual experience creative of a social order. Its immediate outcome is the fundamentals of a polity with implicit legal

concepts whose civic significance cannot be belittled merely because their origin is revelational. The religious ideal of Islam, therefore, is organically related to the social order which it has created. The rejection of the one will eventually involve the rejection of the other. Therefore the construction of a polity on national lines, if it means a displacement of the Islamic principle of solidarity, is simply unthinkable to a Muslim. This is a matter which at the present moment directly concerns the Muslims of India. "Man," says Renan, "is enslaved neither by his race, nor by his religion, nor by the course of rivers, nor by the direction of mountain ranges. A great aggregation of men, sane of mind and warm of heart, creates a moral consciousness which is called a nation." Such a formation is quite possible, though it involves the long and arduous process of practically remaking men and furnishing them with a fresh emotional equipment. It might have been a fact in India if the teaching of Kabir and the Divine Faith of Akbar had seized the imagination of the masses of this country. Experience, however, shows that the various caste-units and religious units in India have shown no inclination to sink their respective individualities in a larger whole. Each group is intensely jealous of its collective existence. The formation of the kind of moral consciousness which constitutes the essence of a nation in Renan's sense demands a price which the peoples of India are not prepared to pay. The unity of an Indian nation, therefore, must be sought, not in the negation but in the mutual harmony and co-operation of the many. True statemanship cannot ignore facts,

however unpleasant they may be. The only practical course is not to assume the existence of a state of things which does not exist, but to recognise facts as they are, and to exploit them to our greatest advantage. And it is on the discovery of Indian unity in this direction that the fate of India as well as Asia really depends. India is Asia in miniature. Part of her people have cultural affinities with nations in the east and part with nations in the middle and west of Asia. If an effective principle of co-operation is discovered in India, it will bring peace and mutual good-will to this ancient land which has suffered so long, more because of her situation in historic space than because of any inherent incapacity of her people. And it will at the same time solve the entire political problem of Asia.

It is, however, painful to observe that our attempts to discover such a principle of internal harmony have so far failed. Why have they failed ? Perhaps we suspect each other's intentions and inwardly aim at dominating each other. Perhaps in the higher interests of mutual co-operation, we cannot afford to part with the monopolies which circumstances have placed in our hands and conceal our egoism under the cloak of a nationalism, outwardly stimulating a large-hearted patriotism, but inwardly as narrow-minded as a caste or a tribe. Perhaps, we are unwilling to recognise that each group has a right to free development according to its own cultural traditions. But whatever may be the causes of our failure, I still feel hopeful. Events seem to be tending in the direction of some sort of internal harmony. And as far as I have been

able to read the Muslim mind, I have no hesitation in declaring that if the principle that the Indian Muslim is entitled to full and free development on the lines of his own culture and tradition in his own Indian home-lands is recognised as the basis of a permanent communal settlement, he will be ready to stake his all for the freedom of India. The principle that each group is entitled to free development on its own lines is not inspired by any feeling of narrow communalism. There are communalisms and communalisms. A community which is inspired by feelings of ill-will towards other communities is low and ignoble. I entertain the highest respect for the customs, laws, religious and social institutions of other communities. Nay, it is my duty according to the teaching of the Quran, even to defend their places of worship, if need be. Yet I love the communal group, which is the source of my life and behaviour and which has formed me what I am, by giving me its religion, its literature, its thought, its culture and thereby recreating its whole past as a living operative factor in my present consciousness. Even the authors of the Nehru Report recognise the value of this higher aspect of communalism. While discussing the separation of Sind they say, "To say from the larger view-point of nationalism that no communal provinces should be created, is, in a way, equivalent to saying from the still wider international view-point that there should be no separate nations. Both these statements have a measure of truth in them. But the staunchest internationalist recognises that without the fullest national autonomy it is extraordinarily difficult to create the international state.



*So also without the fullest cultural autonomy, and communalism in its better aspect is culture, it will be difficult to create a harmonious nation."*

Communalism in its higher aspect, then, is indispensable to the formation of a harmonious whole in a country like India. The units of Indian society are not territorial as in European countries. India is a continent of human groups belonging to different races, speaking different languages and professing different religions. Their behaviour is not at all determined by a common race-consciousness. Even the Hindus do not form a homogeneous group. The principle of European democracy cannot be applied to India without recognising the fact of communal groups. ✓ The Muslim demand for the creation of a Muslim India within India is, therefore, perfectly justified. ✓ The resolution of the All-Parties Muslim Conference at Delhi is, to my mind, wholly inspired by this noble ideal of a harmonious whole which instead of stifling the respective individualities of its component wholes, affords them chances of fully working out the possibilities that may be latent in them. And I have no doubt that this house will emphatically endorse the Muslim demands embodied in this resolution. Personally, I would go further than the demands embodied in it. *I would like to see the Punjab, North-West Frontier Province, Sind and Baluchistan amalgamated into a single state. Self-government within the British Empire or without the British Empire, the formation of a consolidated North-West Indian Muslim State appears to me to be the final destiny of the Muslims, at least of North-West India.* The proposal was put forward before the Nehru Committee. They rejected it on the ground that, if carried into

effect, it would give a very unwieldy state. This is true in so far as the area is concerned; in point of population the state contemplated by the proposal would be much less than some of the present Indian provinces. The exclusion of Ambala Division and perhaps of some districts where non-Muslims predominate, will make it less extensive and more Muslim in population so that the exclusion suggested will enable this consolidated state to give a more effective protection to non-Muslim minorities within its area. The idea need not alarm the Hindus or the British. India is the greatest Muslim country in the world. The life of Islam, as a cultural force, in this country very largely depends on its centralisation in a specified territory. This centralisation of the most living portion of the Muslims of India, whose military and police service has, notwithstanding unfair treatment from the British, made the British rule possible in this country, will eventually solve the problem of India as well as of Asia. It will intensify their sense of responsibility and deepen their patriotic feeling. Thus possessing full opportunity of development within the body politic of India, the North-West India Muslims will prove the best defenders of India against a foreign invasion, be the invasion one of ideas or of bayonets. The Punjab with 56 per cent Muslim population supplies 54 per cent of the total combatant troops in the Indian army, and if the 19,000 Gurkhas recruited from the independent state of Nepal are excluded, the Punjab contingent amounts to 62 per cent of the whole Indian Army. This percentage does not take into account nearly 6,000 combatants supplied to the Indian Army by the North-West Frontier Province and Baluchistan. From this you

can easily calculate the possibilities of North-West India Muslims in regard to the defence of India against foreign aggression. The Right Hon'ble Mr. Srinivasa Sastri thinks that the Muslim demand for the creation of autonomous Muslim states along the north-west border is actuated by a desire "to acquire means of exerting pressure in emergencies on the Government of India." I may frankly tell him that the Muslim demand is not actuated by the kind of motive he imputes to us ; it is actuated by a genuine desire for free development which is practically impossible under the type of unitary government contemplated by the nationalist Hindu politicians with a view to securing permanent communal dominance in the whole of India.

Nor should the Hindus fear that the creation of autonomous Muslim states will mean the introduction of a kind of religious rule in such states. I have already indicated to you the meaning of the word religion as applied to Islam. The truth is that Islam is not a church. It is a state conceived as a contractual organism long before Rousseau ever thought of such a thing, and animated by an ethical ideal which regards man not as an earth-rooted creature, defined by this or that portion of the earth, but as a spiritual being understood in terms of social mechanism, and possessing rights and duties as a living factor in that mechanism. The character of a Muslim state can be judged from what the *Times of India* pointed out some time ago in a leader on the Indian Banking Enquiry Committee. "In ancient India," the paper points out, "the state framed laws regulating the rates of interest, but in Muslim times, although Islam clearly

forbids the realization of interest on money loaned, Indian Muslim states imposed no restrictions on such rates." I therefore demand the formation of a consolidated Muslim state in the best interests of India and Islam. For India it means security and peace resulting from an internal balance of power; for Islam an opportunity to rid itself of the stamp that Arabian imperialism was forced to give it, to mobilize its law, its education, its culture, and to bring them into closer contact with its own original spirit and with the spirit of modern times.

Thus it is clear that in view of India's infinite variety in climates, races, languages, creeds and social systems, the creation of autonomous states based on the unity of language, race, history, religion and identity of economic interests, is the only possible way to secure a stable constitutional structure in India. The conception of federation underlying the Simon Report necessitates the abolition of the Central Legislative Assembly as a popular assembly, and makes it an assembly of the representatives of federal states. It further demands a redistribution of territory on the lines which I have indicated. And the Report does recommend both. I give my whole-hearted support to this view of the matter and venture to suggest that the redistribution recommended in the Simon Report must fulfil two conditions. It must precede the introduction of the new constitution and must be so devised as finally to solve the communal problem. Proper redistribution will make the question of joint and separate electorates automatically disappear from the constitutional controversy of India. It is the

present structure of the provinces that is largely responsible for this controversy. The Hindu thinks that separate electorates are contrary to the spirit of nationalism, because he understands the word 'nation' to mean a kind of universal amalgamation in which no communal entity ought to retain its private individuality. Such a state of things, however, does not exist. Nor is it desirable that it should exist. India is a land of racial and religious variety. Add to this the general economic inferiority of the Muslims, their enormous debt, especially in the Punjab, and their insufficient majorities in some of the provinces as at present constituted, and you will begin to see clearly the meaning of our anxiety to retain separate electorates. In such a country and in such circumstances territorial electorate cannot secure adequate representation of all interests and must inevitably lead to the creation of an oligarchy. The Muslims of India can have no objection to purely territorial electorates if provinces are so demarcated as to secure comparatively homogeneous communities possessing linguistic, racial, cultural and religious unity.

But in so far as the question of the powers of the Central Federal State is concerned, there is a subtle difference of motive in the constitutions proposed by the pundits of India and the pundits of England. The pundits of India do not disturb the Central authority as it stands at present. All that they desire is that this authority should become fully responsible to the Central Legislature which they maintain intact and where their majority will become further reinforced on the nominated element ceasing

to exist. The pundits of England, on the other hand, realising that democracy in the Centre tends to work contrary to their interests and is likely to absorb the whole power now in their hands, in case a further advance is made towards responsible government, have shifted the experience of democracy from the Centre to the provinces. No doubt, they introduce the principle of federation and appear to have made a beginning by making certain proposals; yet their evaluation of this principle is determined by considerations wholly different to those which determine its value in the eyes of Muslim India. The Muslims demand federation because it is pre-eminently a solution of India's most difficult problem, i.e., the communal problem. The Royal Commissioners' view of federation, though sound in principle, does not seem to aim at responsible government of federal states. Indeed, it does not go beyond providing means of escape from the situation which the introduction of democracy in India has created for the British, and wholly disregards the communal problem by leaving it where it was.

Thus it is clear that, in so far as real federation is concerned, the Simon Report virtually negatives the principle of federation in its true significance. The Nehru Report realising Hindu majority in the Central Assembly reaches a unitary form of government because such an institution secures Hindu dominance throughout India; the Simon Report retains the present British dominance behind the thin veneer of an unreal federation, partly because the British are naturally unwilling to part with the power they have so long wielded and partly because it is possible for

them, in the absence of an inter-communal understanding in India, to make out a plausible case for the retention of that power in their own hands. To my mind a unitary form of government is simply unthinkable in a self-governing India. What is called 'residuary powers' must be left entirely to self-governing states, the Central Federal State exercising only those powers which are expressly vested in it by the free consent of federal states. I would never advise the Muslims of India to agree to a system, whether of British or of Indian origin, which virtually negatives the principle of true federation or fails to recognise them as a distinct political entity.

The necessity for a structural change in the Central Government was seen probably long before the British discovered the most effective means for introducing this change. That is why at rather a late stage it was announced that the participation of the Indian Princes in the Round Table Conference was essential. It was a kind of surprise to the people of India, particularly the minorities, to see the Indian Princes dramatically expressing their willingness at the Round Table Conference to join an all-India federation and as a result of their declaration, Hindu delegates—uncompromising advocates of a unitary form of government—quietly agreeing to the evolution of a federal scheme. Even Mr. Sastri who, only a few days before, had severely criticised Sir John for recommending a federal scheme for India, suddenly became a convert and admitted his conversion in the plenary session of the Conference—thus offering the Prime

Minister of England on an occasion for one of his wittiest observations in his concluding speech. All this has a meaning both for the British who have sought the participation of the Indian Princes, and for the Hindus who have unhesitatingly accepted the evolution of an all-India federation. The truth is that the participation of the Indian Princes, among whom only a few are Muslims, in a federation scheme serves a double purpose. On the one hand, it serves as an all-important factor in maintaining the British power in India practically as it is; on the other hand, it gives overwhelming majority to the Hindus in an All-India Federal Assembly. It appears to me that the Hindu-Muslim differences regarding the ultimate form of Central Government are being cleverly exploited by British politicians through the agency of the Princes who see in the scheme prospects of better security for their despotic rule. If the Muslims silently agree to any such scheme it will simply hasten their end as a political entity in India. The policy of the Indian federation, thus created, will be practically controlled by Hindu Princes forming the largest group in the Central Federal Assembly. They will always lend their support to the Crown in matters of Imperial concern; and in so far as internal administration of the country is concerned, they will help in maintaining and strengthening the supremacy of the Hindus. In other words, the scheme appears to be aiming at a kind of understanding between Hindu India and British Imperialism—you perpetuate me in India and I, in return, give you a Hindu oligarchy to keep all other Indian communities in perpetual subjection. If, therefore,



the British Indian provinces are not transformed into really autonomous states, the Princes' participation in a scheme of Indian federation will be interpreted only as a dexterous move on the part of British politicians to satisfy, without parting with any real power, all parties concerned—Muslims with the word federation, Hindus with a majority in the Centre, the British Imperialists—whether Tory or Labourite—with the *substance* of real power.

The number of Hindu states in India is far greater than that of Muslim states; and it remains to be seen how the Muslim demand for 33 per cent seats in the Central Federal Assembly is to be met with in a house or houses constituted of representatives taken from British India as well as Indian states. I hope the Muslim delegates are fully aware of the implications of the federal scheme as discussed in the Round Table Conference. The question of Muslim representation in the proposed all-India federation has not yet been discussed. "The interim report," says Reuter's summary, "contemplates two chambers in the federal legislature, each containing representatives both of British India and states, the proportion of which will be a matter of subsequent consideration under the heads which have not yet been referred to the Sub-Committee." In my opinion the question of proportion is of the utmost importance and ought to have been considered simultaneously with the main question of the structure of the Assembly.

The best course, I think, would have been to start with a British India federation only. A federal

scheme born of an unholy union between democracy and despotism cannot but keep British India in the same vicious circle of a unitary Central Government. Such a unitary form may be of the greatest advantage to the British, to the majority community in British India and to the Indian Princes; it can be of no advantage to the Muslims, unless they get majority rights in five out of the eleven Indian provinces with full residuary powers, and one-third share of seats in the total house of the Federal Assembly. In so far as the attainment of sovereign powers by the British Indian provinces is concerned, the position of His Highness the Nawab of Bhopal, Sir Akbar Hydari and Mr. Jinnah is unassailable. In view, however, of the participation of the Princes in the Indian federation we must now see our demand for representation in the British Indian Assembly in a new light. The question is not one of Muslim share in a British Indian Assembly, but one which relates to representation of British Indian Muslims in an all-India Federal Assembly. Our demand for 33 per cent must now be taken as a demand for the same proportion in the all-India Federal Assembly exclusive of the share allotted to the Muslim states entering the federation.

The other difficult problem which confronts the successful working of a federal system in India is the problem of India's defence. In their discussion of this problem the Royal Commissioners have marshalled all the deficiencies of India in order to make out a case for Imperial administration of the army. "India and Britain," say the Commissioners, "are so

related that India's defence cannot now or in any future which is within sight be regarded as a matter of purely Indian concern. The control and direction of such an army must rest in the hands of agents of Imperial Government." Now does it necessarily follow from this that further progress towards the realisation of responsible government in British India is barred until the work of defence can be adequately discharged without the help of British officers and British troops? As things are, there is a block on the line of constitutional advance. All hopes of evolution in the Central Government towards the ultimate goal prescribed in the declaration of 20th August, 1917, are in danger of being indefinitely frustrated, if the attitude illustrated by the Nehru Report is maintained that any future change involves the putting of the administration of the army under the authority of an elected Indian Legislature. Further to fortify their argument they emphasise the fact of competing religions and rival races of widely different capacity, and try to make the problem look insoluble by remarking that "the obvious fact that India is not in the ordinary and natural sense a single nation is nowhere made more plain than in considering the difference between the martial races of India and the rest." These features of the question have been emphasised in order to demonstrate that the British are only keeping India secure from foreign menace but are also the "neutral guardians" of internal security. However, in federated India, as I understand federation, the problem will have only one aspect, *i. e.*, external defence. Apart from

provincial armies necessary for maintaining internal peace, the Indian Federal Congress can maintain, on the north-west frontier, a strong Indian Frontier Army, composed of units recruited from all provinces and officered by efficient and experienced military men taken from all communities. I know that India is not in possession of efficient military officers and this fact is exploited by the Royal Commissioners in the interest of an argument for Imperial administration. On this point I cannot but quote another passage from the Report which to my mind furnishes the best argument against the position taken up by the Commissioners. "At the present moment," says the Report, "no Indian holding the King's Commission is of higher army rank than a captain. There are, we believe, 39 captains of whom 25 are in ordinary regimental employ. Some of them are of an age which would prevent their attaining much higher rank, even if they passed the necessary examination before retirement. Most of these have not been through Sandhurst, but got their Commissions during the Great War." Now, however genuine may be the desire, and however earnest the endeavour to work for this transformation, overriding conditions have been so forcibly expressed by the Skeen Committee (whose members, apart from the Chairman and the Army Secretary, were Indians) in these words: "Progress must be contingent upon success being secured at each stage and upon military efficiency being maintained, though it must, in any case, render such development measured and slow. A higher command cannot be evolved at short

notice out of existing cadres of Indian officers, all of junior rank and limited experience. Not until the slender trickle of suitable Indian recruits for the officer class—and we earnestly desire an increase in their numbers—flows in much greater volume, not until sufficient Indians have attained the experience and training requisite to provide all the officers for, at any rate, some Indian regiments, not until such units have stood the only test which can possibly determine their efficiency, and not until Indian officers have qualified by a successful army career for the high command, will it be possible to develop the policy of Indianisation to a point which will bring a completely Indianised army within sight. Even then years must elapse before the process could be completed."

Now I venture to ask who is responsible for the present state of things? Is it due to some inherent incapacity of our martial races, or to the slowness of the process of military training? The military capacity of our martial races is undeniable. The process of military training may be slow as compared to other processes of human training. I am no military expert to judge this matter. But as a layman I feel that the argument, as stated, assumes the process to be practically endless. This means perpetual bondage for India, and makes it all the more necessary that the Frontier Army as suggested by the Nehru Report, be entrusted to the charge of a committee of defence, the personnel of which may be settled by mutual understanding.

Again, it is significant that the Simon Report has

given extraordinary importance to the question of India's land frontier, but has made only passing reference to its naval position. India has doubtless had to face invasions from her land frontier; but it is obvious that her present masters took possession of her on account of her defenceless sea coast. A self-governing and free India will, in these days, have to take greater care of her sea coast than land frontiers.

I have no doubt that if a federal government is established, Muslim federal state will willingly agree, for purposes of India's defence, to the creation of neutral Indian military and naval forces. Such a neutral military force for the defence of India was a reality in the days of Mughal rule. Indeed in the time of Akbar the Indian frontier was, on the whole, defended by armies officered by Hindu generals. I am perfectly sure that the scheme for a neutral Indian army, based on a federated India will intensify Muslim patriotic feeling, and finally set at rest the suspicion, if any, of Indian Muslims joining Muslims from beyond the frontier in the event of an invasion.

I have thus tried briefly to indicate the way in which the Muslims of India ought, in my opinion, to look at the two most important constitutional problems of India. A redistribution of British India, calculated to secure a permanent solution of the communal problem, is the main demand of the Muslims of India. If, however, the Muslim demand of a territorial solution of the communal problem is ignored, then I support as emphatically as possible, the

Muslim demands repeatedly urged by the All-India Muslim League and the All-India Muslim Conference. The Muslims of India cannot agree to any constitutional changes which affect their majority rights, to be secured by separate electorates in the Punjab and Bengal, or fail to guarantee them 33 per cent representation in any Central legislature. There were two pitfalls into which Muslim political leaders fell. The first was the repudiated Lucknow Pact which originated in a false view of Indian nationalism and deprived the Muslims of India of chances of acquiring any political power in India. The second is the narrow-visioned sacrifice of Islamic solidarity in the interests of what may be called Punjab ruralism resulting in a proposal which virtually reduces the Punjab Muslims to a position of minority. It is the duty of the League to condemn both the Pact and the proposal.

The Simon Report does great injustice to the Muslims in not recommending a statutory majority for the Punjab and Bengal. It would either make the Muslim stick to the Lucknow Pact or agree to a scheme of joint electorates. The despatch of the Government of India on the Simon Report admits that, since the publication of that document, the Muslim community has not expressed its willingness to accept any of the alternatives proposed by the Report. The despatch recognises that it may be a legitimate grievance to deprive the Muslims in the Punjab and Bengal of representation in the councils in proportion to their population merely because of weightage allowed to Muslim minorities elsewhere.

But the despatch of the Government of India fails to correct the injustice of the Simon Report. In so far as the Punjab is concerned—and this is the most crucial point—it endorses the so-called ‘carefully balanced scheme’ worked out by the official members of the Punjab Government which gives the Punjab Muslims a majority of two over Hindus and Sikhs combined, and a proportion of 49 per cent of the house as a whole. It is obvious that the Punjab Muslims cannot be satisfied with less than a clear majority in the total house. However, Lord Irwin and his Government do recognise that the justification for communal electorates for majority communities would not cease unless and until by the extension of franchise their voting strength more correctly reflects their population; and further unless a two-thirds majority of the Muslim members in a provincial council unanimously agree to surrender the right of separate representation. I cannot, however, understand why the Government of India, having recognised the legitimacy of the Muslim grievance, have not had the courage to recommend a statutory majority for the Muslims in the Punjab and Bengal.

Nor can the Muslims of India agree to any such changes which fail to create at least Sind as a separate province and treat the North-West Frontier Province as a province of inferior political status. I see no reason why Sind should not be united with Baluchistan and turned into a separate province. It has nothing in common with Bombay Presidency. In point of life and civilization the Royal Commis-



sioners find it more akin to Mesopotamia and Arabia than India. The Muslim geographer Mas'udi noticed this kinship long ago when he said: "Sind is a country nearer to the dominions of Islam." The first Omayyad ruler is reported to have said of Egypt: "Egypt has her back towards Africa and face towards Arabia." With necessary alterations the same remark describes the exact situation of Sind. She has her back towards India and face towards Central Asia. Considering further the nature of her agricultural problems which can invoke no sympathy from the Bombay Government, and her infinite commercial possibilities, dependent on the inevitable growth of Karachi into a second metropolis of India I think it unwise to keep her attached to a presidency which, though friendly today, is likely to become a rival at no distant period. Financial difficulties, we are told, stand in the way of separation. I do not know of any definite authoritative pronouncement on the matter. But assuming there are any such difficulties, I see no reason why the Government of India should not give temporary financial help to a promising province in her struggle for independent progress.

As to the North-West Frontier Province, it is painful to note that the Royal Commissioners have practically denied that the people of this province have any right to reforms. They fall far short of the Bray Committee and the council recommended by them is merely a screen to hide the authority of the Chief Commissioner. The inherent right of the Afghan to light a cigarette is curtailed merely

because he happens to be living in a powder house. The Royal Commissioners' epigrammatic argument is pleasant enough, but far from convincing. Political reform is light, not fire; and to light every human being is entitled whether he happens to live in a powder house or a coal mine. Brave, shrewd and determined to suffer for his legitimate aspirations, the Afghan is sure to resent any attempt to deprive him of opportunities of self-development. To keep such a people contented is in the best interests of both England and India. What has recently happened in that unfortunate province is the result of a step-motherly treatment shown to the people since the introduction of the principle of self-government in the rest of India. I only hope that British statesmanship will not obscure its view of the situation by hoodwinking itself into the belief that the present unrest in the province is due to any extraneous causes.

The recommendation for the introduction of a measure of reform in the North-West Frontier Province made in Government of India's despatch is also unsatisfactory. No doubt, the despatch goes farther than the Simon Report in recommending a sort of representative council and a semi-representative cabinet, but it fails to treat this important Muslim province on an equal footing with other Indian provinces. Indeed the Afghan is by instinct more fitted for democratic institutions than any other people in India.

I think I am now called upon to make a few observations on the Round Table Conference. Per-

sonally I do not feel optimistic as to the results of this Conference. It was hoped that away from the actual scene of communal strife and in a changed atmosphere, better counsels would prevail and a genuine settlement of differences between the two major communities of India would bring India's freedom within sight. Actual events, however, tell a different tale. Indeed, the discussion of the communal question in London has demonstrated more clearly than ever the essential disparity between the great cultural units of India. Yet the Prime Minister of England apparently refuses to see that the problem of India is international and not national. He is reported to have said that "his Government would find it difficult to submit to Parliament proposals for the maintenance of separate electorates since joint electorates were much more in accordance with British democratic sentiments." Obviously he does not see that the model of British democracy cannot be of any use in a land of many nations; and that a system of separate electorates is only a poor substitute for a territorial solution of the problem. Nor is the Minorities Sub-Committee likely to reach a satisfactory settlement. The whole question will have to go before the British Parliament; and we can only hope that the keen-sighted representatives of British nation, unlike most of our Indian politicians will be able to pierce through the surface of things and see clearly the true fundamentals of peace and security in a country like India. To base a constitution on the concept of a homogeneous India or to apply to India principles dictated

by British democratic sentiments is unwittingly to prepare her for a civil war. As far as I can see, there will be no peace in the country until the various peoples that constitute India are given opportunities of free self-development on modern lines without abruptly breaking with their past.

I am glad to be able to say that your Muslim delegates fully realise the importance of a proper solution of what I call Indian international problem. They are perfectly justified in pressing for a solution of the communal question before the question of responsibility in the Central Government is finally settled. No Muslim politician should be sensitive to the taunt embodied in that propaganda word—communalism—expressly devised to exploit what the Prime Minister calls British democratic sentiments and to mislead England into assuming a state of things which does not really exist in India. Great interests are at stake. We are 70 millions and far more homogeneous than any other people in India. Indeed the Muslims of India are the only Indian people who can fitly be described as a nation in the modern sense of the word. The Hindus, though ahead of us in almost all respects, have not yet been able to achieve the kind of homogeneity which is necessary for a nation, and which Islam has given you as a free gift. No doubt they are anxious to become a nation, but the process of becoming a nation is a kind of travail, and, in the case of Hindu India involves a complete overhauling of her social structure. Nor should the Muslim leaders and politicians allow themselves to be carried away

by the subtle but placid arguments that Turkey and Iran and other Muslim countries are progressing on national, i.e., territorial, lines. The Muslims of India are differently situated. The countries of Islam outside India are practically wholly Muslim in population. The minorities there belong, in the language of the Quran, to the "people of the Book." There are no social barriers between Muslims and the "people of the Book." A Jew or a Christian or a Zoroastrian does not pollute the food of a Muslim by touching it, and the law of Islam allows inter-marriage with the "people of the Book." Indeed the first practical step that Islam took towards the realization of a final combination of humanity was to call upon peoples possessing practically the same ethical ideal to come forward and combine. The Quran declares: "O people of the Book! Come, let us join together on the word (Unity of God) that is common to us all." The wars of Islam and Christianity, and later, European aggression in its various forms, could not allow the infinite meaning of this verse to work itself out in the world of Islam. Today it is being gradually realized in the countries of Islam in the shape of what is called Muslim Nationalism.

It is hardly necessary for me to add that the sole test of the success of our delegates is the extent to which they are able to get the non-Muslim delegates of the Conference to agree to our demands as embodied in the Delhi Resolution. If these demands are not agreed to, then a question of a very great and far-reaching importance will arise for the community.

Then will arrive the moment for an independent and concerted political action by the Muslims of India. If you are at all serious about your ideals and aspirations, you must be ready for such an action. Our leading men have done a good deal of political thinking and their thought has certainly made us, more or less, sensitive to the forces which are now shaping the destinies of peoples in India and outside India. But I ask, has this thinking prepared us for the kind of action demanded by the situation which may arise in the near future? Let me tell you frankly that, at the present moment, the Muslims of India are suffering from two evils. The first is the want of personalities. Sir Malcolm Hailey and Lord Irwin were perfectly correct in their diagnosis when they told the Aligarh University that the community had failed to produce leaders. By leaders I mean men who, by divine gift or experience, possess a keen perception of the spirit and destiny of Islam, along with an equally keen perception of the trend of modern history. Such men are really the driving forces of a people, but they are God's gift and cannot be made to order. The second evil from which the Muslims of India are suffering is that the community is fast losing what is called the herd instinct. This makes it possible for individuals and groups to start independent careers without contributing to the general thought and activity of the community. We are doing today in the domain of politics what we have been doing for centuries in the domain of religion. But sectional bickerings in religion do not do much harm to our solidarity. They, at least, indicate an interest in what makes the sole principle of our structure as a

people. Moreover, this principle is so broadly conceived that it is almost impossible for a group to become rebellious to the extent of wholly detaching itself from the general body of Islam. But diversity in political action, at a moment when concerted action is needed in the best interests of the very life of our people, may prove fatal. Now shall we, then, remedy these two evils? The remedy of the first evil is not in our hands. As to the second evil, I think it is possible to discover a remedy. I have got definite views on the subject; but I think it is proper to postpone their expression till the apprehended situation actually arises. In case it does arise, leading Muslims of all shades of opinion will have to meet together, not to pass resolutions but finally to determine the Muslim attitude and to show the path to tangible achievement. In this address I mention this alternative only, because I wish that you may keep it in mind and give some serious thought to it in the meantime.

Gentlemen, I have finished. In conclusion I cannot but impress upon you that the present crisis in the history of India demands complete organisation and unity of will and purpose in the Muslim community, both in your own interest as a community, and in the interest of India as a whole. The political bondage of India has been and is a source of infinite misery to the whole of Asia. It has suppressed the spirit of the East and wholly deprived her of that joy of self-expression which once made her the creator of a great and glorious culture. We have a duty towards India where we are destined to live and die. We have a duty towards Asia, especially Muslim Asia. And since 70 millions

of Muslims in a single country constitute a far more valuable asset to Islam than all the countries of Muslim Asia put together, we must look at the Indian problem not only from the Muslim point of view but also from the standpoint of the Indian Muslim as such. Our duty towards Asia and India cannot be loyally performed without an organised will fixed on a definite purpose. In your own interest, as a political entity among other political entities of India, such an equipment is an absolute necessity. Our disorganised condition has already confused political issues vital to the life of the community. I am not hopeless of an inter-communal understanding, but I cannot conceal from you the feeling that in the near future our community may be called upon to adopt an independent line of action to cope with the present crisis. And an independent line of political action, in such a crisis, is possible only to a determined people, possessing a will focalised by a single purpose. Is it possible for you to achieve the organic wholeness of a unified will? Yes, it is. Rise above sectional interests and private ambitions, and learn to determine the value of your individual and collective action, however directed on material ends, in the light of the ideal which you are supposed to represent. Pass from matter to spirit. Matter is diversity ; spirit is light, life and unity. One lesson I have learnt from the history of Muslims. At critical moments in their history it is Islam that has saved Muslims and not *vice versa*. If today you focus your vision on Islam and seek inspiration from the ever-vitalising idea embodied in it, you will be only re-assembling your scattered forces, regaining your lost



integrity, and thereby saving yourself from total destruction. One of the profoundest verses in the Holy Qur'an teaches us that the birth and rebirth of the whole of humanity is like the birth and rebirth of a single individual. Why cannot you who, as a people, can well claim to be the first practical exponents of this superb conception of humanity, live and move and have your being as a single individual? I do not wish to mystify anybody when I say that things in India are not what they appear to be. The meaning of this, however, will dawn upon you only when you have achieved a real collective ego to look at them. In the words of the Qur'an, "Hold fast to yourself; no one who erreth can hurt you, provided you are well guided." (5 : 105)

---

## II

*Presidential address delivered at the annual session of the All-India Muslim Conference at Lahore on the 21st March 1932.*

Gentlemen, the Muslims of India have listened to so many addresses from their political platforms that the more impatient of them have already begun to suspect our deliberations which, they think, tend to enfeeble, and eventually to kill, the spirit of action that lies dormant in the heart of Islam. "The present situation in the country," said one of them, "whets our appetite for action; and if our leaders fail to point to a definite course of action suitable to the peculiar position

of the Indian Muslims, the sheer force of imitation will do its work, and make our youth thoughtlessly plunge into the stream of events." "Action," said another with characteristic youthful impatience, "does not need a previously thought out plan; it is not subject to the logic of schools, but develops its own peculiar logic as it emerges out of the heart of man into open space." Such is the present psychology of our youth. I am grateful to you for the confidence you have placed in me at this critical moment; but I certainly can't congratulate you on your choice of a man who is nothing more than a visionary idealist. Perhaps you think you need a visionary at this juncture; for where there is no vision the people perish. Perhaps you think I am better equipped for the presidential chair of this assembly after my experiences at the London Conference. To reveal an ideal freed from its temporal limitations is one function; to show the way how ideals can be transformed into living actualities is quite another. If a man is temperamentally fit for the former function his task is comparatively easy, for it involves a clean jump over temporal limitations which waylay the practical politician at every step. The man who has got the courage to migrate from the former to the latter function has constantly to take stock of, and often yield to, the force of those very limitations which he has been in the habit of ignoring. Such a man has the misfortune of living in the midst of perpetual mental conflict and can be easily accused of self-contradiction. However, I gladly accept the difficult position in which you have placed me, not because I consider myself fit for that

position, but because the issues have fortunately become so clear that the whole thing now depends not so much on the guidance of one particular individual as on the force of all the individual wills focussed on a single purpose.

Politics have their roots in the spiritual life of man. It is my belief that Islam is not a matter of private opinion. It is a society, or if you like, a civic church. It is because present-day political ideals, as they appear to be shaping themselves in India, may affect its original structure and character that I find myself interested in politics. I am opposed to nationalism as it is understood in Europe, not because, if it is allowed to develop in India, it is likely to bring less material gain to Muslims. I am opposed to it because I see in it the germs of atheistic materialism which I look upon as the greatest danger to modern humanity. Patriotism is a perfectly natural virtue and has a place in the moral life of man. Yet that which really matters is a man's faith, his culture, his historical tradition. These are the things which, in my eyes, are worth living for and dying for, and not the piece of earth with which the spirit of man happens to be temporarily associated. In view of the visible and invisible points of contact between the various communities of India I do believe in the possibility of constructing a harmonious whole whose unity cannot be disturbed by the rich diversity which it must carry within its bosom. The problem of ancient Indian thought was how the one became many without sacrificing its oneness. Today this problem has come down from its ethical heights to the grosser plane of our political life, and we have to solve it in its reversed

form, *i.e.*, how the many can become one without sacrificing its plural character. In so far then as the fundamentals of our policy are concerned, I have got nothing fresh to offer. Regarding these I have already expressed my views in my address<sup>1</sup> to the All-India Muslim League. In the present address I propose, among other things, to help you, in the first place, in arriving at a correct view of the situation as it emerged from a rather hesitating behaviour of our delegation at the final stages of the deliberations of the Round Table Conference. In the second place, I shall try, according to my lights, to show how far it is desirable to construct a fresh policy now that the Premier's announcement at the last London Conference has again necessitated a careful survey of the whole situation. Let me begin with a brief history of the work of our delegation.

The first two meetings of the Minorities Committee were held on the 28th of September and the 1st of October 1911, respectively. On both occasions the meeting was adjourned for a private settlement of the communal problem. Mahatma Gandhi first told the Muslim delegation that matters could not proceed until the Muslim delegation had lifted the embargo on Dr. Ansari. Failing in this, he gave the Muslim delegation to understand that he would personally agree to Muslim demands and would try to persuade the Congress, the Hindus and the Sikhs to agree to them, provided the Muslims agreed to three things: (i) adult suffrage; (ii) no special representation for the Untouchables; and (iii) Congress demand for com

plete independence. The Mahatma declined to refer the matter to the Congress and failed in his efforts to get the Hindus and the Sikhs to agree to this arrangement. On the 7th of October, two prominent Hindu leaders proposed that the whole matter might be referred to a board of seven arbitrators. This too was rejected by Hindu and Sikh representatives. On the 8th the Minorities Committee met for the third time. In this meeting Mahatma Gandhi set to the account of the British Government his failure to bring about a communal settlement, since, according to him, they had deliberately chosen for the British Indian delegation men who, as he said, had no representative character. On behalf of the Muslim delegation, the late Sir Muhammad Shafi refuted the Mahatma's uncalled for remarks questioning the representative character of the various delegations, and opposed the proposals put forward by him. The meeting came to an end, and, owing to the British general elections, could not meet till the 12th of November. In the meantime, private conversations recommenced on the 15th October. A prominent feature of these conversations was Sir Geoffrey Corbett's scheme relating to the Punjab. This scheme, very similar to the one I had suggested in my address to the All-India Muslim League, proposed the adoption of joint electorates with the exclusion of the Ambala Division from the Punjab. It, too, was rejected by Sikh and Hindu representatives who could not tolerate a Muslim majority in the Punjab even with a system of joint electorates. These conversations also remaining fruitless, the representatives of the Indian minorities which constitute nearly half of India,

began to consult one another on the possibility of an Indian Minorities Pact. On the 12th of November all these minorities, with the exception of Sikhs, signed a pact, which was formally handed over to the British Premier in the last meeting of the Minorities Committee held on the 13th of November.

This brief account of our informal conversations speaks for itself. It is obvious that our delegates did their best to arrive at a communal settlement. The only thing which is a mystery to me, and which will perhaps ever remain a mystery, is the declaration made on the 26th of November by our spokesmen in the Federal Structure Committee to the effect that they agreed to the simultaneous introduction of provincial autonomy and central responsibility. Whether this was due to their anxiety for conciliation and political advance of the country, or to some conflicting influences which operated on their minds, I cannot say. On the 15th of November, the day on which I dissociated from our delegation, Muslim delegates had decided not to participate in the discussions of the Federal Structure Committee. Why did they participate then in these discussions contrary to their own decision? Were our spokesmen on the Federal Structure Committee authorised to make the declaration of 26th November? I am not in a position to answer these questions. All that I can say is that the Muslim community considers the declaration a very grave error and I have no doubt that this Conference will give an emphatic expression to their views on this important matter. In my address to the All-India Muslim League I raised my voice against the idea of an all-

India federation. Subsequent events have shown that it is working only as a drag on the political advance of India. If the introduction of central responsibility is dependent on the completion of an all-India federation, which I fear will take a fairly long time, then the Government should immediately introduce responsible government in the British Indian provinces, so that the foundation thus delineated may, till the coming of central responsibility, fully prepare itself by experience to bear the weight of the federal superstructure. A great deal of spade work is needed before we can have a really modern federal state.

I have reason to believe, and had suspected this some days before I dissociated myself from our delegation, that our spokesmen were badly advised by certain English politicians in rejecting the immediate introduction of responsible government in the provinces of British India. Recently Lieutenant-Commander Kenworthy has expressed the same view. He says: "I understand that the moderate leaders in London were badly advised on this matter by certain English politicians, that they listened too readily to their advice and rejected the great instalment of provincial autonomy. And the curious thing is that the Mahatma was apparently ready to consider this instalment sympathetically." Who are the moderate leaders alluded to by the Lieutenant-Commander? In view of the attitude taken up by Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru in London and now in the Consultative Committee regarding the immediate introduction of provincial autonomy, it is obvious that the writer of the passage quoted could not have meant Hindu Liberals. I think he probably means Muslim moderate leaders

whose declaration in the Federal Structure Committee on the 26th of November seems to me to be really responsible for the British Premier's announcement regarding the simultaneous introduction of central and provincial responsibility. And since immediate introduction of responsible government in the provinces would have involved a definite announcement regarding the demands of our community as to majority rights in the Punjab and Bengal, we must not forget, while judging the present situation, that the conduct of our own leaders is mainly responsible for the British Premier's silence which has raised all sorts of suspicions in the mind of the Muslim community.

The next question is to explore the possibilities of shaping, if necessary, a new policy after the disappointing announcement made by the British Premier at the close of the last London Conference. Muslims have naturally grown apprehensive of Government's attitude towards the problem of communal settlement. They suspect that the Government will purchase Congress co-operation at any cost, and that its delay in conceding Muslim demands is only a cover for the possibility of finding some basis for negotiations with that body. The policy of trusting the Government in regard to political issues seems to be rapidly losing its hold on the mind of the community. The Franchise Committee has postponed consideration of matters relating to the formation of constituencies. As for the promised provisional settlement, it is obvious that no communal settlement, provisional or permanent, can satisfy the Muslim community, which does not recognise, as its basic principle, the right of the community



to enjoy majority rights in provinces where it happens to be in actual majority. The continuance of separate electorates and the status of the Frontier Province are no doubt assured, but complete provincial autonomy, transfer of power from Parliament to Indian provinces, equality of federal units, classification of subjects not into federal, central and provincial, but into federal and provincial only, majority rights in the Punjab and Bengal, unconditional separation of Sind; and one-third share in the centre, constitute no less essential elements of our demand. The Premier's silence on these points has only resulted in the unsound policy of war with the Congress and no peace with the rest of the country. Shall we then join the Congress in their present campaign? My answer without a moment's hesitation is "No." A careful reading of the underlying motives of this movement will make it perfectly clear.

To my mind this movement has its roots in fear and resentment. The Congress leaders claim that they are the sole representatives of the peoples of India. The last Round Table Conference made it abundantly clear that they were not. This they naturally *resent*. They know that the British people and the rest of the world now fully realise the importance of communal settlement in India. They further know that the minorities of India have arrived at a pact, and that the British Government have given a notice to enforce a provisional settlement of their own, in case the Indians themselves failed to arrive at one. The Congress leaders *fear* that the British Government in their provisional settlement of the communal problem may concede to the minorities what they demand:

They have, therefore, started the present campaign to bolster up a claim which has no foundation in fact, to defeat a pact which, they fear, may find a place in the coming constitution, and to force the Government to settle the matter of minorities with the Congress alone. The Congress resolution in pursuance of which the civil disobedience campaign was launched made it perfectly clear that since Government had refused to regard Mahatma Gandhi as the sole representative of the country, the Congress decided on civil disobedience. How can then a minority join a campaign which is directed as much against itself as against Government ?

In the circumstances, therefore, to join the Congress in their present campaign is simply out of the question. But there is no denying that at the moment you are called upon to make important decisions. I am sure you are fully aware of the present state of the community's mind. Government's delay in conceding Muslim demands and the treatment meted out to our brave Frontier brethren on the eve of the constitutional reform in their province are making Indian Muslims suspicious of British methods ; and most people are already asking the question whether the power of a third party in India does constitute a real safeguard for the Muslim minority against a politically hostile and economically exploiting majority in India. There seems to be a deeper reason also. The rapid movement of events, and often sudden changes of situation in the political world, cannot permit an Imperial democracy, especially in the case of Party Government, to adhere for any long

periods of time to definite policies. Lack of imagination is a virtue rather than a fault in a modern politician. And owing to this lack of imagination which is incapable of synthesising permanence and change in a higher political concept, modern politics is driven to live from hand to mouth. In the case of a subject country like India, therefore, co-operating communities are naturally led to think that the firmness of their political attitude in difficult times for the Government may be of little or no value in the eyes of this or that political party which may come to power at any time in England. Whatever may be the character and ideals of political parties in England, you must base your policy on *enlightened self-interest* and conceive it in a spirit calculated to impress the whole British nation. It is folly to fight a battle in which there is likelihood of the fruits of victory going to those who are either hostile to, or have no sympathy with, our legitimate political aspirations. The present circumstances are such that in thinking out a line of policy with a view to get over the immediate difficulties of the community, it is your duty to see that the likelihood I apprehend is eliminated, and the benefit of the action advised by you finally accrues to your community.

Let me state the position as plainly as possible. The British undertook to give a provisional decision of the communal problem in case the communities of India did not arrive at a mutual settlement after their representatives had returned from the second Round Table Conference. This undertaking was thoroughly consistent with the claim and the policy of the

British as a third party holding the balance between the contending communities of India. The British Government's present attitude, however, would show that they do not mean to function as an impartial holder of balance in India, and are indirectly driving the Indian communities, which are mainly Hindus and Muslims, to a kind of civil war. We tried the majority community and found them unwilling to recognise the safeguards which we can forego at the risk of complete extinction as a nation determined to live its own life. The alternative was to hope for justice from the British who, ever since they took the country from the Muslims, have claimed, as I have said above, to function as an impartial holder of balance in India. In their case, too, we find that the old British courage and straightforwardness are replaced by a constantly shifting policy which can inspire no confidence and seems to be calculated only to facilitate their own position in India. The Muslim community is thus brought to face the question whether it is in the *interest* of the community that their present policy which has so far obviated British difficulties and brought no gain to the community shall continue for any further period of time. This is a question for the open Conference to decide. All that I can say at the present stage is that, if you decide to discontinue this policy, your immediate duty is to prepare the whole community for the kind of self-sacrifice without which no self-respecting people can live an honourable life. The most critical moment in the history of the Indian Muslims has arrived. Do your duty or cease to exist.

Gentlemen, I now request you to turn for a moment to two matters of gravest concern to the Muslims of India—I mean the Frontier Province and Kashmir which, I have no doubt, are uppermost in your mind.

It is indeed gratifying to see that Government have at least conceded our demand regarding the political status of North-West Frontier Province though it remains to be seen what this status means in the actual administration of that province. Newspaper reports show that in the matter of franchise, Government rules have been more liberal than in other provinces. The reform machinery will, it is understood, be set in full working order from the next month. What, however, has taken grace out of the whole affair is the simultaneous launching of a campaign of repression which is not essentially different from martial law. The consideration shown in the matter of constitutional issue has been more than neutralized by the severity and short-sightedness shown in the case of the administrative issue. Government may have reasons for counteracting extremist activities of certain people in that part of the country, but it has surely not been able to defend a policy of wholesale repression. During this struggle in other parts of India Britain's dealing with the situation has not been entirely devoid of restraint. In the Frontier Province alone repression has assumed forms unworthy of a civilized Government. If oral reports are true then the heart of the British official in the Frontier Province stands in need of a reform far greater in importance for the British Empire than the constitu-

tional reform sought to be introduced into that province. There is no definite and final information about the number of arrests and persecutions; but as it is roughly mentioned in newspapers, thousands have been arrested and convicted or interned. It is for the Government to consider whether the incongruent policies of concession and repression will result in the pacification of a proud race like the Afghans. Abdul Ghaffar Khan certainly commands a great deal of influence among the young border Afghans, but what has extended the sphere of his influence to the farthest ends of the territory and to the ignorant folk of the Frontier villages, is the present thoughtless policy of repression. Government cannot be unaware of the fact that the all-India policy of the Indian Muslims was, at this juncture, effectively keeping in check the tendencies of the Muslims of that province to join hands with those who were for an unconditional alliance with the Congress. Perhaps there have been difficulties from the Government point of view; yet I think a little different handling of the administrative action could have saved the whole situation. The political situation in the Frontier, it appears, was allowed to deteriorate during the period when a policy of relaxation was the order of the day, and attempts to deal with it in a repressive manner have been made at a time when the real remedy of the disease had been prescribed. The sooner the Government withdraws all repressive measures from the province the better for the province and the Government itself. The situation has caused deep concern to

the whole Muslim community in India, and it is hardly wise for the Government not to allay Muslim feeling in this respect.

As to Kashmir it is hardly necessary for me to describe the historical background of events which have recently happened in that country. The apparently sudden resurrection of a people in whom the ego-flame had been almost extinguished ought to be, in spite of the suffering which it has necessarily involved, a matter of rejoicing to all those who possess an insight into the inner struggle of modern Asiatic peoples. The cause of the people of Kashmir is absolutely just, and I have no doubt that the rebirth of this sense of reality of their own personality in an intelligent and skilful people will eventually prove a source of strength not only to the State but also to the people of India as a whole. What, however, is most deplorable is that the communal ill-feeling existing in India, and the perfectly natural sympathy of the Indian Muslims with their Kashmir brethren, led to a kind of counter-agitation among the Hindus, which in its despair, sought to portect a barbarous administration by attributing its inevitable consequences to such wild fancies as Pan-Islamic plots and conspiracies for British occupation of Kashmir. Such agitation and the communal colour thereby given to the Kashmir question could have led only to one thing—resort to violent repression leading to prolonged lawlessness in the State. In parts of the Jammu Province, as newspaper reports tell us, the administration has completely broken down and it is only the presence of British troops which is keeping things in control at least in places where

they are present. Oral reports of a most violent and shameful repression practised by State authorities in many places are still pouring in. Nor can commissions of enquiry be of any help in such a state of things. The Middleton Report which admits important facts and fails to draw legitimate conclusions therefrom has already failed to satisfy Muslims. The truth is that the matter has passed the stage in which enquiries can lead to effective results. The growing sense of self-consciousness in the people all over the world is now demanding recognition in the shape of a desire for an increasing share in the administration which governs them. Political tutelage is good for a primitive people but it is in the best interests of an administration itself not to shirk from radical reform when a change in the outlook of a people demands it. Among other things which have probably arisen from the peculiar conditions obtaining in Kashmir, the people of that country demand some kind of a popular assembly. Let us hope that the ruler of the State and the Government of India will consider the people's demand as favourably as they possibly can. I have no doubt that the new Prime Minister, with characteristic British administrative acuteness, will see into the heart of the matter, and provide scope for the activity of a fine but down-trodden people who gave some of the best intellects to ancient India, and later added a real charm to Mughal culture. There may be difficulties in the way of constitutional reform in Kashmir as in the case of our own country; but the interests of permanent peace and order demand that these difficulties must be speedily overcome.



If the meaning of the present upheaval is not properly understood and its causes are sought in directions where they cannot be found, the Kashmir Government, I fear, will have made its problem much more complicated.

It is obvious, therefore, that the attitude of the British Government towards our demands and the gravity of the situation in the Frontier Province and Kashmir claim our immediate attention. But what claims our immediate attention is not our only concern. We must have a clear perception of the forces which are silently moulding the future, and place a relatively permanent programme of work before the community in view of the probable direction of events in the country. The present struggle in India is sometimes described as India's revolt against the West. I do not think it is a revolt against the West; for the people of India are demanding the very institutions which the West stands for. Whether the gamble of elections, retinues of party leaders and hollow pageants of parliaments will suit a country of peasants to whom the money-economy of modern democracy is absolutely incomprehensible, is a different question altogether. Educated urban India demands democracy. The minorities, feeling themselves as distinct cultural units and fearing that their very existence is at stake, demand safeguards, which the majority community, for obvious reasons, refuses to concede. The majority community pretends to believe in a nationalism theoretically correct, if we start from Western premises, belied by facts, if we look to India. Thus the real parties to the present struggle in India are

not England and India, but the majority community and the minorities of India which can ill-afford to accept the principle of Western democracy until it is properly modified to suit the actual conditions of life in India.

Nor do Mahatma Gandhi's political methods signify a revolt in the psychological sense. These methods arise out of a contact of two opposing types of world-consciousness, Western and Eastern. The Western man's mental texture is chronological in character. He lives and moves and has his being in time. The Eastern man's world-consciousness is non-historical. To the Western man things gradually become; they have a past, present and future. To the Eastern man they are immediately rounded off, timeless, purely present. That is why Islam which sees in the time-movement a symbol of reality appeared as an intruder in the static world-pictures of Asia. The British as a Western people cannot but conceive political reform in India as a systematic process of gradual evolution. Mahatma Gandhi as an Eastern man sees in this attitude nothing more than an ill-conceived unwillingness to part with power and tries all sorts of destructive negations to achieve immediate attainment. Both are elementally incapable of understanding each other. The result is the appearance of a revolt.

*A warning or sign of —*

These phenomena, however, are merely premonitions of a coming storm, which is likely to sweep over the whole of India and the rest of Asia. This is the inevitable outcome of a wholly political civilization which has looked upon man as a *thing*

to be exploited and not as a *personality* to be developed and enlarged by purely cultural forces. The peoples of Asia are bound to rise against the acquisitive economy which the West has developed and imposed on the nations of the East. Asia cannot comprehend modern Western capitalism with its undisciplined individualism. The faith which you represent recognises the worth of the individual, and disciplines him to give away his all to the service of God and man. Its possibilities are not yet exhausted. It can still create a new world where the social rank of man is not determined by his caste or colour or the amount of dividend he earns, but by the kind of life he lives; where the poor tax the rich, where human society is founded not on the equality of stomachs but on the equality of spirits, where an Untouchable can marry the daughter of a king, where private ownership is a trust and where capital cannot be allowed to accumulate so as to dominate the real producer of wealth. This superb idealism of your faith, however, needs emancipation from the medieval fancies of theologians and legists. Spiritually we are living in a prison-house of thoughts and emotions which during the course of centuries we have woven round ourselves. And be it further said to the shame of us—men of older generation—that we have failed to equip the younger generation for the economic, political and even religious crises that the present age is likely to bring. The whole community needs a complete overhauling of its present mentality in order that it may again become capable of feeling the urge of fresh desires and ideals. The Indian

Muslim has long ceased to explore the depths of his own inner life. The result is that he has ceased to live in the full glow and colour of life, and is consequently in danger of an unmanly compromise with forces which, he is made to think, he cannot vanquish in open conflict. He who desires to change an unfavourable environment must undergo a complete transformation of his inner being. God changeth not the condition of a people until they themselves take the initiative to change their condition by constantly illuminating the zone of their daily activity in the light of a definite ideal. Nothing can be achieved without a firm faith in the independence of one's own inner life. This faith alone keeps a people's eyes fixed on their goal and saves them from perpetual vacillation. The lesson that past experience has brought to you must be taken to heart. Expect nothing from any side. Concentrate your whole ego on your self alone, and ripen your clay into real manhood if you wish to see your aspirations realized. Mussolini's maxim was: "He who has steel has bread." I venture to modify it a bit and say: "He who is steel has everything." Be hard and work hard. This is the whole secret of individual and collective life. Our ideal is well defined. It is to win in the coming constitution a position for Islam which may bring her opportunities to fulfil her destiny in this country. It is necessary in the light of this ideal to rouse the progressive forces of the community and to organise their hitherto dormant energies. The flame of life cannot be borrowed from others; it must be kindled in the temple of

one's own soul. This requires earnest preparation and a relatively permanent programme. What then shall be our future programme? I am inclined to think that it should be partly political, partly cultural. I venture to offer a few suggestions for your consideration.

First, we must frankly admit that there is yet a sort of chaos in the political thought of those who are supposed to guide the activities of the Indian Muslims in the present-day political struggle. The community, however, is not to blame for this state of things. The Muslim masses are not at all lacking in the spirit of self-sacrifice when the question of their ultimate destiny in the country is involved. Recent history bears ample testimony to what I say. The fault is ours, not theirs. The guidance offered to the community is not always independently conceived, and the result is ruptures, sometimes at critical moments, within our political organisations. Thus these organisations cannot properly develop the kind of discipline which is so absolutely essential to the life and power of political bodies. To remedy this evil I suggest that the Indian Muslims should have only one political organisation with provincial and district branches all over the country. Call it whatever you like. What is essential is that its constitution must be such as to make it possible for any school of political thought to come into power and to guide the community according to its own ideas and methods. In my opinion this is the only way to make ruptures impossible, and to re-integrate and discipline our scattered forces to the

best interests of Islam in India.

Secondly, I suggest that this central organisation should immediately raise a national fund of at least 50 lakhs of rupees. No doubt we are living in hard times but you may rest assured that the Muslims of India will not fail to respond to your call if a genuine effort is made to impress upon them the gravity of the present situation.

Thirdly, I suggest the formation of youth leagues and well-equipped volunteer corps throughout the country under the control and guidance of the central organisation. They must specially devote themselves to social service, custom reform, commercial organisation of the community and economic propaganda in towns and villages specially in the Punjab where enormous indebtedness of Muslim agriculturists cannot be allowed to wait for the drastic remedies provided by agrarian upheavals. Things appear to have reached the breaking point as in China in 1925 when peasant leagues came into being in that country. The Simon Report admits that the peasant pays a 'substantial portion' of his means to the state. The state, no doubt, gives him in return peace and security, trade and communication. But the net result of these blessings has been only a kind of scientific exactitude in taxation, destruction of village economy by machine-made goods and the commercialisation of crops which makes the peasant almost always fall a prey to money-lenders and commercial agents. This is a very serious matter especially in the Punjab. I want the proposed youth leagues to specialise in propaganda work in this connection,

and thus to help the peasantry in escapinng from its present bondage. The future of Islam in India largely depends, in my opinion, on the freedom of Muslim peasants in the Punjab. Let then the fire of youth mingle with the fire of faith in order to enhance the glow of life and to create a new world of actions for our future generations. A community is not merely a purely present and numerable whole of men and women. Indeed its life and activity as a living reality cannot be fully understood without a reference to that unborn infinity which lies asleep in the deeps of its inner being.

Fourthly, I suggest the establishment of male and female cultural institutes in all the big towns of India. These institutes as such should have nothing to do with politics. Their chief function should be to mobilise the dormant energy of the younger generation by giving them a clear grasp of what Islam has already achieved and what it has still to achieve in the religious and cultural history of mankind. The progressive forces of a people can be roused only by placing before them a new task calculated to enlarge the individual, to make them comprehend and experience the community, not as a heap of isolated fragments of life, but as a well-defined whole possessing inner cohesion and solidarity. And when once these forces are roused they bring fresh vigour for new conflicts, and that sense of inner freedom which enjoys resistance and holds out the promise of a new self. These institutes must keep in close touch with our educational institutions—old and new—with a view to secure the ultimate convergence of all the lines of our educational

endeavour on a single purpose. One practical suggestion I can immediately make. The Hartog Committee's Interim Report now apparently forgotten in the rush of other political problems, makes the following recommendation which I consider of the utmost importance for the Muslims of India :

" There can be no doubt that if in provinces where the educational progress of the Muhammadan community is impeded by religious difficulties, such arrangements for religious instruction can be made as will induce that community to send its children to ordinary schools ; the public system will gain both in economy and efficiency and much will be done to free the community from the handicap and the reproach of educational backwardness."

"We are fully aware that such arrangements are not easy to make and that in other countries they have given rise to much controversy.....But in our opinion the time is ripe and more than ripe for a determined effort to devise practical plans." (pages 204-205).

And again on page 206 while discussing reservations the Report says:

" If therefore special arrangements inside the public system were made now, and possibly for some time to come, to enable the Muhammadan community to take its full share in the life and in the advance of the nation, this would not, in our opinion, be inconsistent either with sound democratic or sound educational principles. We wish we could say that no reservations are necessary



and we should certainly wish that they should be as small as possible. As complications of an educational system they are undesirable in themselves, but since, in our belief, they represent a necessary alternative to leaving the Muhammadan community in its present backward state, and leaving it to take the poor chances afforded by a system of segregate institutions, we have no hesitation in embracing that alternative as justifiable on broad grounds of national policy."

The proposed cultural institutes or till their establishment the All-India Muslim Conference must see that these recommendations, based as they are on a clear perception of the present handicaps of our community, are carried into effect.

Fifthly, I suggest the formation of an assembly of *ulama* which must include Muslim lawyers who have received education in modern jurisprudence. The idea is to protect, expand and, if necessary, to re-interpret the law of Islam in the light of modern conditions, while keeping close to the spirit embodied in its fundamental principles. This body must receive constitutional recognition so that no bill affecting the personal law of Muslims may be put on the legislative anvil before it has passed through the crucible of this assembly. Apart from the purely practical value of this proposal for the Muslims of India, we must remember that the modern world, both Muslim and non-Muslim, has yet to discover the infinite value of the legal literature of Islam and its significance for a capitalistic world whose ethical

standards have long abdicated from the control of man's economic conduct. The formation of the kind of assembly I propose will, I am sure, bring a deeper understanding of the usual principles of Islam at least in this country.

### III

*Speech on the Budget, 1927-28 delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on 5th March, 1927.*

Sir, I would pass a few general remarks on the Budget that was presented to the Council on the 28th of February. No one who has read the speech made by the Honourable the Finance Member<sup>1</sup> and the Memorandum prepared by the Finance Secretary<sup>2</sup> can remain unimpressed by the remarkable lucidity of these documents. I must say as a layman that I have learned a great deal from them. In fact the Finance Secretary has very candidly suggested the criticism to which the general financial position of the province is open. He has told us that we spent 23 lakhs more than our income last year; and we are going to spend 60 lakhs more than our income this year; that is to say, in two years we shall have spent 83 lakhs more than our income. The question, therefore, arises whether we are justified in spending large sums of money on development. The general financial position, however, in view of the various considerations

---

<sup>1</sup> Sir Geoffrey de Montmorency.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. (later Sir) H. W. Emerson.

set forth in the review by the Finance Secretary, is satisfactory; though he has told us that it is not permissible to reduce the taxes in the absence of permanent funds. Now, so far as reduction of taxes is concerned, I will offer a few remarks presently. But in view of the fact that the general financial position of this province is satisfactory some provision ought to have been made in the Budget at least for rural sanitation as well as for medical relief for women. In fact, medical relief for women is badly needed in this province and no provision seems to have been made for this in the Budget. I would, therefore, draw your attention, sir, and the attention of the honourable members of the Council to this very important consideration. As to the reduction of taxes, I suppose the Finance Secretary, when he prepared his admirable review of the financial position of the province, was not aware of the remission made by the Government of India. We now know that 80 lakhs have been remitted (Mr. H. D. Craik: *May be remitted*) of which 60 lakhs are recurring and 20 lakhs non-recurring. If this large amount is remitted, as I hope it will be remitted, my submission is that money should be spent towards the reduction of taxes, that is to say, towards the removal of the anomaly which exists in our system of taxation. The anomaly I mean is this: that we do not apply the principle of progression in the case of land revenue whereas we apply that principle in the case of income-tax.

The reason why this principle is not applied to land revenue is sometimes found in the barbarous theory that all land belongs to the Crown. Neither in ancient

India nor even in the days of the Mughals the sovereign ever claimed universal ownership. This is the historical aspect of the matter. The Taxation Enquiry Committee also has accepted this position, though half the members of that Committee were of the opinion that land revenue could not be described as a tax, the other half being of the opinion that it is in the nature of a tax. But the fact remains that in this country the sovereign never claimed any such rights. We are told that the Mughals claimed such rights; but the people of the Punjab owned and possessed the land of this country long before the race of Babar entered into history—the unmistakable lesson of which is that Crowns come and go; the people alone are immortal:

سکندر رفت و ششیر و علم رفت  
خواجه شهر و کنگ کان و یم رفت  
امم را از شہاں پانندہ تر دان  
نمی بینی کہ ایران ماند و جم رفت

I submit, therefore, that in this twentieth century such a theory, even if it existed in any country at any time, cannot hold good. In case this money is remitted we should apply it towards the reduction of taxes. We should apply the principle of progression to land revenue. At present all land is subject to land revenue. Whether a man holds two kanals of land, he is liable to pay the land revenue. In the case of income-tax the principle of ability or the principle of progression is applied, that is to say, there is a graduated scale and some people do not pay income-tax at all. My submission, therefore, is that the Council should consider the question of the reduction of taxes in the light of this principle.

## IV

*Speech on the cut motion on Government's demand for grant under 'Education' delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 10th March, 1927.*

Sir, the question of education is extremely important and I am glad to see that the honourable members<sup>1</sup> who have preceded me have spoken with great enthusiasm on the subject. They have emphasised the fact that education is a common interest, that it affects all classes of people of this land—Hindus, Muslims, Sikhs, capitalists and labourers—but they have not looked at the problem from the stand-point of a foreign government. A disinterested foreign government is a contradiction in terms. The foreign government in this country wants to keep the people ignorant. A foreign government is a kind of Roman Catholic Church trying to suppress all the agencies that tend to enlighten the laity. The honourable gentleman<sup>2</sup> who preceded me has conclusively proved from facts and figures given in the 'Report on the Progress of Education in the Punjab for the year 1925-26' that we are wasting tremendous amounts of money on education with no results. Can anybody deny in this House or outside this House that mass education is absolutely essential in the interest of the people? Primary education, secondary education<sup>3</sup>, professional or vocational education are all various

1 Pandit Nanak Chand and Chaudhri Afzal Haq.

2 Pandit Nanak Chand.

aspects of the same problem of mass education. Well, the ancient sages of this country used to say that the world is *maya* or illusion. I do not know whether the world outside this House is *maya* but I am absolutely certain that whatever happens inside this House is nothing but *maya*, though I must say that I am also a part and parcel of this illusion. Let me take the various stages of education, that is to say, primary education, secondary education and higher education. Now, whatever interpretations may be put upon this Report, one fact is perfectly clear from it, and it is this, that the principle of compulsion must be immediately applied. If you turn to page 2 of the Report, I mean the 'Proceedings of the Ministry of Education', you will find the following :

"Thus, as the Director has observed, compulsion should not be regarded as an ideal of distant future, but rather as a present and practical means of ensuring that the sums of money devoted to vernacular education are spent to the most fruitful purpose. It is hoped, therefore, that local authorities and all concerned will take immediate and effective steps toward a more rapid extension of the compulsory principle."

At the same time the education expert, Mr. Mayhew, whom I have the privilege to know personally, has told us that, in so far as the voluntary system is concerned, the present outlook is gloomy. This is an argument in favour of the fact that the principle of compulsion must be applied. We are told that it is applied in the case of 42 municipalities and some 400, perhaps more than 400, rural areas. What happens there? We do not know anything from this

Report. We do not know whether any persons were ever fined for not sending their children to schools. Nor do we know the number of teachers who are teaching in these schools. Unless we are given sufficient information, we cannot say what these rural areas and municipalities are doing? As far as my personal information goes, I can tell the members of this House, that nothing is being done and that there is an absolute waste of money. Only you have opened some schools and ostensibly compulsory, but not at all different to voluntary primary schools. I submit, sir, that these schools are doing nothing at all, and in fact the way in which they are working does not amount to the adoption of the principle of compulsion. The Report virtually establishes that the principle of compulsion must be adopted. In fact in the amount of money that we are wasting on primary education the Report before us finds an argument in favour of the adoption of this principle. It says that a very large number of boys join the first class but the money spent upon them is wasted as most of them fail to reach the higher classes. If you are spending a very large amount of money on them, then it is your duty to see that they reach the higher classes. Make them reach the higher classes by compulsion. Therefore my submission is that in so far as primary education is concerned, it is absolutely necessary in the interest of this province to adopt the principle of compulsion at once.

---

## V

*Speech on the motion for adjournment regarding communal riots delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 18th July, 1927.*

Sir, the disease with which we are dealing is a chronic one. There are a good many physicians who have tried to diagnose it. Some have achieved a certain amount of success; others have failed signally in their undertaking. Different physicians have prescribed different remedies for the disease, but in the words of the poet

شد پریشان خواب من از کثرت تعبیرها

these remedies have failed to achieve the desired end, viz., they have failed to discover a panacea for the evil which has fallen to the lot of this unhappy province.

Some people have ascribed this evil to the struggle for securing more posts under the Government while others have assigned reasons which are diametrically opposed to this contention. From the speech made by Pandit Nanak Chand one gathers the impression that his heart is full of love for humanity; but this pious talk is nothing more than a cloak for the idea uppermost in the Pandit's mind. We are not prepared to let go what we have already got hold of. Lip service to God with an eye stealing glances at the property of others!

Some of the members are of the opinion that the gutter Press of the province is responsible for the existing state of affairs, while others are of opinion that the struggle for votes and posts is responsible for it. There is no dearth of suggestions, but no body seems willing



to act upon them. Just after the occurrence of the Lahore riots a joint committee representing all shades of opinion and thought was constituted at Lahore, and a meeting of the same was held at the house of R. B. Moti Sagar. But I regret very much to say that this meeting was the first and last meeting of this joint committee. In this meeting I suggested that in order to eradicate the spirit of mutual hatred it behoved the committee to appoint a number of small sub-committees whose business it should be to go about the different parts of the city and impress upon the people the futility of mutual warfare. But my suggestion met the usual fate of all such proposals. We indulged in much pious talk and everything ended in a fiasco.

In this Council impassioned speeches for inter-communal unity are made. We are asked to constitute joint committees and conciliation boards. But I wish to bring home this lesson to everybody in this Council that procrastination will not mend matters. If you want to do anything, do it without further loss of time. I wonder if the members have realised the fact that we are actually living in a state of civil war. If stringent measures are not taken to put this down, the atmosphere of the whole province will be poisoned.

I support Chaudhri Zafarullah Khan from the bottom of my heart that a round table conference should be held at the earliest possible moment in which Government should also be asked to participate. This conference should carefully consider the present situation and suggest ways to suppress the existing communal tension. If this communal hatred permeates the rest of the country and the people living in villages

also come to loggerheads, God alone knows where eventually it will land us.

## VI

*Speech on the resolution regarding filling of posts by open competitive examination delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 19th July, 1927.*

Sir, after the Honourable the Finance Member's<sup>1</sup> speech, which to my mind constitutes a most crushing reply to the resolution as framed,<sup>2</sup> it is hardly possible for anyone in this House to make a substantial addition to the discussion. However, I cannot but admire the innocent idealism of Sardar Ujjal Singh, which idealism, like all idealisms, sees everything except realities. I can assure my honourable friend that the principle of competition, pure and simple, is absolutely inapplicable in this country, especially in this province. I suppose many honourable members of this House know that such a non-communal institution as the Punjab University has had to adopt the system of fictitious roll numbers in the various University examinations. The examiner, according to this system, does not know as to the caste or creed or colour of the candidate whose paper he is examining or the

<sup>1</sup> Sir Geoffrey deMontmorency.

<sup>2</sup> The resolution was moved by Sardar Ujjal Singh and read: "This Council recommends to the Government that in future all posts under Government in all departments should be filled by open competition as far as possible; and where this cannot be done and selection has to be made the most highly qualified candidate should be selected without regard to caste, creed or colour."

college from which he comes. This system was adopted because it was feared that Hindu examiners might fail Muslim candidates and Muslim examiners might fail Hindu candidates. (Voices : Shame). Yes, it is a shameful thing; but it does exist. With all that both Hindu and Muslim candidates leave certain marks in their examination papers to indicate to the examiner the candidate's caste or creed. Only the other day, I was reading the LL.B. examination papers. I found the number "786" which is the numerical value of an Arabic formula and on others I found "Om" marks meant to invoke the blessing of God as well as to reveal to the examiner the community of the candidate. Such is the state of things in a non-communal institution. Take another instance. During the recent riots in Lahore, both Hindu and Muslim citizens went in deputations to the Deputy Commissioner on several occasions—each community complaining of the investigating officers belonging to the opposite community. I happened to be a member of one such deputation. (Voices : Shame). It is not a matter to be ashamed of. We have to see things as they are; and it is a pity that they have come to such a pass. You know, sir, what the Deputy Commissioner told us. I think he was perfectly right in saying what he did. He said "Before the Reforms scheme came into operation, there were 120 British officers in the police department, but that they were only 68 now. We have not got a sufficient number of British officers. Both communities want European officers."

My friend, Pandit Nanak Chand, is unfortunately not here at the present moment. He told us that

Government had removed the colour distinction, so that the posts which formerly went to British gentlemen now go to Hindus and Muslims ; but I assure my friend that Government had made a very great mistake and I would welcome if there were more British officers. (Voices : No, no). I fully realise my responsibility when I say this and I also realise the meaning of this voice of "no, no." I am not enamoured of that false and shallow nationalism which speaks like this. (Dr. Shaikhs Muhammad<sup>1</sup> Alam Everybody is not the same). Well, it may be so, yet the talk of a united nationalism is futile and will perhaps remain so for a long time to come. The word has existed on the lips of the people of this country for the last fifty years and like a hen it has cackled a great deal without laying a single egg. However, I will tell you that the state of this country is such that it is not possible for us to introduce the principle of competition pure and simple. The best method for the country is the one indicated by Sir Geoffrey de Montmorency in his speech, that is to say, the principle of competition tempered by selection and nomination.

One other thing I should like to point out. I was very glad to hear the honourable member for Simla<sup>1</sup>. I mean his advocacy of the Untouchables in an almost apostolic tone. I welcome it though I do not know what Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya's verdict would be in this matter (L. Mohan Lal : It is the same as mine). Only a short time ago he excommunicated one of his nearest relatives because he had given his daughter to a Brahmin of an inferior caste. (L. Mohan

---

<sup>1</sup> Lala Mohan Lal, B.A., LL.B.

Lal : He did not). It was in the papers and Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya was called upon to publish a reply to open letters which were addressed to him and he published no contradiction. However, I welcome the change, if it is not in theory alone and I hope that through the efforts of my friend, the honourable member for Simla, untouchability will be removed in this province. In Southern India we hear that when a Brahmin is constrained to talk to an Untouchable he must talk to some wall or tree nearby and the Untouchable too has to address, in reply, the same wall or the tree since the Brahmin is too sacred to be addressed by a Sudra. I shall welcome the day when such bans are entirely removed and the Hindus of this province adopt better principles of equality.

Sir, I need not say anything more with regard to the principle of competition. My friend<sup>2</sup> has pointed out certain defects in the present system which he has enumerated. He refers to the success of the principle of competition in other countries. I must say that the state of things in this country is totally different to the state of things in other countries. For this reason the principles the application of which is good in other countries would not apply to this country. In this country one community is always aiming at the destruction of the other community. Therefore the power in whose hands lies the destiny of this country must adopt a line of action which is calculated equally to elevate all communities that form the population of this country. It has been argued that the present system tends to retard the progress of what

---

<sup>2</sup> Sardar Ujjal Singh, M.A.

my friend<sup>1</sup> called nationality. Well, I do not know whether it is desirable to become a nation. It is a proposition which can be controverted but assuming that it is so, I would suggest that it is first desirable to develop mutual trust in the communities of this country. The present state of things is such that the communities do not trust each other; they have no faith in each other. When we meet each other we talk of nationalism, we talk of philanthropy and of love of mankind. Only a few days ago a friend of mine told me that he had overheard two Hindu gentlemen talking. One of them asked the other as to what should be our policy now. The other gentleman said : [Let nationalism be on your lips, but fix your gaze always on your own community.

## VII

*Speech on the resolution regarding Unani and Ayurvedic systems of medicine delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 22nd February, 1928.*

Sir, the impression is gaining ground amongst the people of this country that the Government has commercial interests in view and is, for this reason, encouraging Western system of medicine on the one side and discouraging indigenous system of medicine on the other. I do not know how far this impression has basis in truth but the fact remains that the *Unani* and *Ayurvedic* systems of medicine do not find favour with the Government.

In my opinion, in spite of all that the supporters of the Western system of medicine say, the latter has yet to learn much from the *Unani* system of medicine.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sardar Ujjal Singh M.A.

Many of the books written on the *Unani* system and specially those written by Najib-ud-Din Samarqandi, have not been published. There are in the libraries of Europe many works which, if published, are sure to serve as eye-openers to those who boast of superiority of the Western system of medicine. Nor can we lose sight of the fact that ours is a poor country. Its people cannot afford an expensive system of medicine. It is, therefore, essential to introduce and encourage a cheaper system. From this point of view I think our *Unani* and *Vedic* systems very much suit the people. Of course the way in which our medicines are prepared is defective and requires improvement. An institution is needed to teach pharmacy. Our own system of pharmacy, I believe, is more conducive to the health of the people than any other methods. If you excuse me, sir, a little digression, I may mention that while I was in England an English friend of mine told me that our way of cooking food was unnatural so much so that the original flavour of the food was entirely lost in the act of cooking it. He praised the Western way of cooking food. Thereupon I told him that what we did with our food, the Westerners did with their medicines. Coming back to the point I think that if the Government were to take up the question of improving the indigenous systems of medicines seriously, these systems are sure to prove much more useful to the people of this country. I will, therefore, request the Government to give a little more attention to this matter.

---

## VIII

*Speech on the resolution regarding application of the principles of assessment of income-tax to the assessment of land revenue delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 23rd February 1928*

Sir, I am glad to see that the Honourable Member for Revenue<sup>1</sup> did not make any attempt to justify the present system of assessment on the basis of state ownership of land. He left it very wisely for the honourable member for Simla<sup>2</sup>. I am afraid this offers a fitting occasion for the application of that humorous Punjabi proverb *chor nalon pand kalhi*, that is to say, the property stolen is readier to run away than the thief. (A voice : Who is the thief ?) You may understand it as you like. Since the honourable member for Simla has raised this point, I think it necessary to dispose of it with a few remarks. Let me tell the honourable representative for Simla that the first European author to refute this theory was the Frenchman Perron in the year 1777. Later in 1880 Briggs made a very extensive inquiry as to the law and practice in India and relating to the theory of state ownership of land. He gives in his book an accurate description of the laws of Manu, of Muslim law and the practices prevailing in the various parts of India—Bengal, Malwa, the Punjab, etc., and arrives at the conclusion that in no period in the history of India the state ever claimed the proprietorship of land. In the time of Lord Curzon, however, this theory was put forward, but the Taxation Committee's report which

---

<sup>1</sup> Sir Fazl-i-Husain.

<sup>2</sup> Lala Mohan Lal, B.A., LL.B.



was published sometime ago has come to a very clear finding that this theory has no basis at all. That is, I believe, the reason why the Honourable Revenue Member has not tried to defend the present system on the ground of that theory. (Revenue Member : Not necessarily). If you agree, sir the Honourable Member may argue on the basis of that theory if he likes. But in his first speech on the subject he did not try to defend the present system of assessment on the basis of that theory. (Revenue Member : I did not want to).

And we take it that the Government does not rely upon that. However, we have to see, in the first place, how far the present system of assessment is just. Workable it is and sanctioned by a very old tradition ; but we have first to see whether it has justice on its side or not. My submission is that it is not at all just. The injustice of it is perfectly clear. If a man happens to be landowner, big or small does not matter, he has to pay land revenue. But if a man earns from sources other than land less than two thousand rupees a year you don't tax him at all. That is where injustice comes in. Nobody can deny that the system is unjust. It is no argument to say that since there are insuperable difficulties in the way of the removal of this injustice, therefore it must be perpetuated. We must admit that there is injustice and we ought to seek proper remedies in order to remove the injustice in so far as it is possible. I have no hesitation in admitting that there are serious difficulties in the way of the application of the principle of income-tax to land revenue. As a matter of fact one reason why I withdrew a more or less similar resolution which I sent in

last time was this, that I felt that there were serious difficulties and the matter had to be further investigated, although the difficulties that were then in my mind have not at all been referred to by the Honourable Revenue Member, and I need not mention them until I have heard what other members have got to say. (A voice : You cannot speak again). I do not then want to tell the House the difficulties that struck me. (A voice : Is that a secret ?) It is an open secret to which the Official Secrets Act does not apply.

The arguments that the learned Member for Revenue put forward are, in the main, two. In the first place, he argues that we are constantly in need of money : the province needs money for its development, and that the Government does not practise alchemy. I think the Government need not practise alchemy so long as they have in their pocket all tillers of the soil whose hard work turns dust into gold. But this kind of argument can be applied in defence of any kind of evil practice which brings the required amount of money. But assuming that this argument has force, I submit that the deficiency caused in the land revenue by the adoption of a different system of land revenue may be met in other ways. For instance, we can reduce the expenditure on administration. We can lower the limit of taxable income under the Income-Tax Act. We can spend less on the so-called development which is a very dignified expression for something which has not brought us anything so far. We can further meet it from the remissions made by the Government of India.

Again the Honourable the Revenue Member has

tried to meet the argument that the whole burden of land revenue falls on the shoulders of the consumer or by showing that the consumer indirectly shares in that burden. The argument is plausible ; but personally I feel very doubtful of its validity. One must not forget the condition of things prevailing in this province. We gave up *batai* long ago. (Revenue Member : Not yet). Practically. The Land Revenue Bill does not recognise *batai*. (Revenue Member : There is no amended Act yet). In general practice *batai* is given up. I do not know what would be the attitude of my zamindar friends. On economic grounds, probably the *batai* system, to my mind, is better. However, the prices of the produce of the land are determined by the demand of the consumer and the prices, as the Honourable the Finance Member<sup>1</sup> has pointed out, determine the amount of land revenue. But the moment the land revenue is determined, then it becomes a fixed amount for a number of years. If after the fixing of the amount prices go up, then there is a chance for the seller to profit by the rise of prices ; but if the prices fall down, then I am afraid, the consumer has really no share in the burden of land revenue. (Revenue Member : If prices rise ?) Well it is a matter of chance. They may rise or they may fall. (Revenue Member : Then the consumer pays).

I have a serious doubt about this. The whole situation depends upon chance. If prices rise, it goes to his profit ; if the prices fall down, the argument which the Honourable the Revenue Member put forward has no application. The consumer helps in the

---

1 Sir Geoffrey de Montmorency.

determination of land revenue, but after the land revenue is fixed, then the whole thing is left to chance. We should not forget that the production is also uncertain especially in areas where the land is *barani*. Again the Honourable the Revenue Member argued that this system should either be continued or be given up at once. There is no third alternative possible. In this connection I beg to say that this is not the spirit of the resolution moved by the honourable member from Rohtak<sup>2</sup>. The spirit of the resolution is that if you recognise that the present system is unjust then do something to make a beginning towards the remedying of that injustice. Definite suggestions were made by the honourable members who preceded me in connection with this matter. I think it is easy to do so without definitely introducing the principle of income-tax in our land revenue system. It can be done by amending section 48 of the Land Revenue Act. I have already submitted an amendment to this effect, though I am afraid the prospect for that amendment is not very bright. I, therefore, suggest that holdings not exceeding five *bighas* and situated in the non-irrigated area where the produce is practically fixed, should not be liable to the payment of land revenue. This can be done without deciding the question whether the principle of income-tax should be applied to assessment of land or not. If you lay down that a holding not exceeding five *bighas* is revenue-free, I do not think there will be very great deficiency in the land revenue. At any rate, if there is a large deficiency, I think it can probably be met by reducing expenditure in other directions.

---

<sup>2</sup> Rai Sahib Chaudhri (later Chaudhri Sir) Chhotu Ram

Lastly, as regards the argument of the Honourable the Revenue Member, or rather the fear that he expressed that this resolution may mean the death of the baby, the Land Revenue Bill, and the apprehensions that it will amount to infanticide. Well, in these days of birth-control, I think infanticide does not matter especially when we know that the child is going to be a very wicked one. I do not think it is demanding too much if the holdings to the extent of five *bighas* should be declared revenue-free. I hope that Government will give serious consideration to this point. Personally I agree even if you make it less than five *bighas*. (Revenue Member : Five acres). An economic holding in this province is about ten or eleven *bighas*. At any rate, five *bighas* is half the economic holding. I do not think that remission of land revenue in the case of persons holding five *bighas* would cause very great deficiency. (Ch. Afzal Haq : Only two crores). My calculation was that it was much less than two crores. (Revenue Member : Not quite that if you let out only the two acre men). Two and a half crores. (Revenue Member : *Gunaah be lazzaf*).

If you commit this fruitless sin, it would show that there is at least some sense of justice in you. Reference was also made by one of the honourable members to sending a kind of commission of inquiry to Russia. I am afraid several commissions have already been sent to Russia, though not from this country. My honourable friend is probably not aware of the causes that led to the Russian revolt. It is not necessary to detail those causes : a good deal of literature has sprung up since the Russian revolt concerning the things that

happened and the system that has been adopted there. Books written by such men as Bertrand Russel and others who have devoted their time to economic questions have appeared. But I think my honourable friend Pandit Nanak Chand has already given an effective reply to the proposal made by Ch. Afzal Haq that, at the present moment, the Punjab zamindar is not ready to give up the right of private ownership. In this country, there are petty landholders, there are proprietors with two *bighas*, two kanals. They are practically like tenants, yet are not willing to give up the right of private ownership. My submission, therefore, is that Government should give some consideration to the demand embodied in this resolution; they should give some relief to the small proprietor, the produce of whose land is obviously insufficient to maintain his family.

---

## IX

*Speech on the Budget, 1929-30 delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 4th March 1929.*

Sir, I am afraid the Budget which has been presented to this Council presents a financial position which, in the words of the Honourable the Finance Member<sup>1</sup> even a confirmed optimist cannot regard as entirely satisfactory. And the statement with which this Budget is presented is so concise and so absolutely frank that its very frankness makes it extremely difficult for the reader to criticise it. However, there are certain points which must be noticed. One remarkable

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. A. M. Stow, O.B.E. I.C.S.

feature of this Budget is, and this is the first Budget that has this feature, that the contribution to the Government of India finds no place in it. But its most unfortunate feature is that after five years' continuous prosperity we are, for the first time, confronting a deficit Budget. The small increase in Excise and Stamps is no source of satisfaction, because it means an increase in drunkenness and litigation which reflects credit neither on the people nor on the Government. On the expenditure side of the Budget for 1928-29 the only excess is under Irrigation and Jails. The increase under Irrigation is due to floods in August, and the increase under Jails is due to an increase in the number of prisoners and also to higher prices of food. Well, floods are a natural phenomenon and cannot be prevented, but unless we are complete fatalists, crime is a preventable affair. If appropriate methods to prevent crime are adopted, it can be prevented to a very large extent. The present state of affairs is such that the man who steals cattle worth Rs. 10 is sent to jail for two years, and I think this is very largely responsible for the increase in the number of prisoners in the jails.

In the Budget Estimate of 1929-30 the first thing which I would like to note is Education. Graph No. 4 in the Memorandum tells us that the amount allotted to Education is 1,81. In the statement of the Honourable the Finance Member on page 6 we find it is 1,67. I was not able to understand these figures, because if 12 lakhs on new expenditure are added to 1,67 the sum is 1,79 and not 1,81. (Mr. J. G. Beazley : May I explain, sir, that that figure includes expendi-

ture on works, repairs and stationery). Very well, sir. The state of things so far as Education is concerned is very very disappointing. I was going to say, awful. In 1922-23 55 new schools in all came up for grants-in-aid, out of which 16 were Islamia schools. The total amount of grants made to schools was Rs. 1,21,906, out of which a sum of Rs. 29,214 went to Muslim schools. In 1926-27, the total amount of grant to high schools was 1,22,287 and the same amount, namely, Rs. 29,214 went to Muslim schools, i. e., 23 per cent of the total amount. In 1927-28 the total amount of grant was Rs. 10,13,154 and the share of Muslim schools was Rs. 2,04,330, that is to say, the population which is most backward in education and most indebted got only 2 lakhs out of 10. This is a state of affairs which cannot be regarded as satisfactory. Yet we are told that there are savings in the beneficent departments which Mr. Penny<sup>1</sup> describes as instances of over-budgetting. I am not at all opposed to spending large sums on education nor is it the purpose of this criticism to raise any such opposition; but I should submit that the money spent on education must be spent carefully and must be distributed equally especially in places where people are backward and too poor to pay for education. However, I need not dwell on this point because I believe it will be taken up when the motions for cuts come up before the House.

I would now like to say a few words about capital expenditure. In 1928-29 the budgetted estimate for capital expenditure charged to revenue was 1.81 lakhs. It was later raised to 1.89 and the revised estimate

---

<sup>1</sup>Finance Secretary (now Financial Commissioner, Development)



shows Rs. 2,12 lakhs. For 1929-30, the capital expenditure is expected to be Rs. 1,54 lakhs. Since extraordinary receipts will not amount to much it is proposed to borrow Rs. 1,40 lakhs from the Provincial Loans Fund. This is a very regrettable state of affairs. The province is already in debt. On pages 22-23 of the Budget you will find the exact position of the province. It will be seen that the loans from the public amount to 3 crores while the loans from the Government of India prior to 31st March 1929 and the year subsequent thereto amount in the aggregate to about 26 crores. Of course, this sum does not include the loans which have been sanctioned from 1st March 1929. We are now compelled to borrow another sum of 1,40 lakhs in spite of what the Honourable the Finance Member, says at page 4 of his statement which runs as follows :

"It has been found impossible to proceed with the full programme of buildings and roads and it is contemplated that 48 lakhs less will be expended under this head in 1929-30 than is shown in the revised estimate for 1928-29. It is also contemplated to reduce transfers to the Revenue Reserve Fund to 5 lakhs only instead of the 15 lakhs budgetted for 1928-29."

I think it was Charles Lamb who said that mankind are really divided into two classes, creditors and debtors. In so far as this province is concerned, if we drop the religious labels, Hindu and Muslim, and substitute the economic labels, lenders and borrowers, Lamb's remark is perfectly true. But my fear is that this province, as a whole, may now be made a permanent member of debtor class. Thus the present finan-

cial position is very disappointing and it is not an easy matter to discover new sources of revenue.

However, I venture to make a suggestion. In the first place, I should like the Government to move the Government of India to provincialise income-tax. That would improve our position to some extent. I may, in the next place, suggest the imposition of death duties as they have in England. (Revenue Member : Living duties would be more appropriate)! These would be living duties because it is the living who would have to pay them. Some limit such as those inheriting property to the value of Rs 20,000 or 30,000 may be fixed. Next we should try reduction of high salaries and purchase of our machinery from the cheapest markets.

## X

*Speech on the Budget 1930-31 delivered in the Punjab Legislative Council on the 7th March 1930.*

Sir, I should like to offer a few general observations on the financial position of the province as revealed in this Budget. In his very clear and lucid Memorandum Mr. Penny<sup>1</sup> has given the present position in a nutshell. On page 13 he says :

“Even after these special efforts at economy revenue receipts stand at 10.95 lakhs and expenditure at 11.22 lakhs with no provision for a transfer to the Revenue Reserve Fund, and there will thus be a deficit in the year of 27 lakhs. The only consolation is that provision has been made for expenditure of 23 lakhs on special flood repairs,

<sup>1</sup>Finance Secretary (now Financial Commissioner, Development)

and if this is excluded from consideration as abnormal and non-recurring, the Budget just balances."

Now, I am afraid the consolation given by Mr. Penny does not prove of much consequence in view of what he himself says at page 16 :

"A glance at the first graph prefixed to this Memorandum will show that the year 1930-31 will be the third in succession to show an excess of expenditure over receipts in the revenue account. It is true that fortune has been singularly unkind in the last two years and the deficits in both are capable of convincing explanation. But the hard fact remains that if the series since 1921 is taken as a whole, good years and bad years balance, and that the financial system must be adapted to fluctuations which nature herself prescribes. If the decade has been marked by unprecedented floods in the Jumna in 1924 and in the Indus and the Jhelum in 1929, by failure of the *rabi* harvest in 1921, by a strange disaster to the wheat crop in 1928, and by cotton disease in 1926, there have been compensating gains in the reassessments of land revenue that fortunately fell due in the last five years, in the good harvest from 1921 to 1926 and above all in the complete remission of provincial contributions to the Central Government. The continued extension of canal irrigation has made the prosperity of the province and its revenues more and more secure, and added to the resources from which progress in future must be financed. Regarded in the light of the experience of the past

nine years the Budget of the year 1930-31 has a special significance."

This is the part of the paragraph to which, I will draw your special attention :

"The deficit in the revenue account may be attributed to the completion of flood repairs, but what is of far greater importance is the fact that even if the cost of flood repairs is excluded, the Budget has been balanced only with difficulty and by jettisoning a number of works that had already received the approval of the Legislature and, but for unforeseen delays or the need for economy, would already have been under construction."

Mr. Penny then discusses the causes of the present financial position and is driven to what he calls a somewhat melancholy conclusion that the present state of things is not a passing phase but has come to stay. He says :

"The inevitable but somewhat melancholy conclusion to be drawn from an examination of the Budget for 1930-31 is that it represents not a passing phase which can be attributed to seasonal misfortunes or flood calamities but a state of things that is likely to continue."

Now, sir, we know that the province is already in debt. The problem of unemployment is becoming more and more acute every day. Trade is at a low ebb. You can easily imagine what the financial future of the province is likely to be. I am inclined to think that the present position is due not so much to stationary revenues as to the present system of administration which necessitates high salaries in the matter

of which the people of this province have no say. There are to my mind only three alternatives open to the people of this province—either have the present system with all its ugly daughters, such as deficit Budgets, communal bickerings, starving millions, debt or unemployment, or do away with the present system root and branch, or retain the form of the present system and secure the power to pay less for it. There is no other alternative. This system must come to an end if you want to live a comfortable life. We spend more than any other country in the world on the present system of administration. There is no other country which spends so much on the administration. (Mr. H. Calvert : Question) The honourable member may reply when his turn comes. My belief is that we pay much more than our revenues justify. So far as expenditure in regard to which we have some say is concerned, I support the proposition that a retrenchment committee ought to be appointed so that we may be able to see whether any further reductions are possible.

I now proceed to offer a few remarks on Industry and Education. We spend practically nothing on industry. And as I have said before and as many other speakers have pointed out, industrial development alone can save us from the curse of unemployment. There is a good future for weaving industry and for shoe-making industry in this province and if we encourage these industries, I think we shall be able to save the province from unemployment, provided we protect these industries against Cawnpore and Ahmedabad.

Again we have spent a good deal of money on education and with what results ? The report on the progress of education in this province shows that there has been a fall of 27,000 students and about 1,000 schools. The cause of this fall, as mentioned in the report, is lack of propaganda work on the part of school inspectors. I do not agree that that is the real cause. The real cause of this phenomenon ought to be sought elsewhere. I have a copy before me of the facts and figures relating to the work of the Education Minister<sup>1</sup> during the last three years. Unfortunately I cannot go through all these figures within the fixed time-limit ; I would draw your attention only to the special grants to unaided schools during 1928-29. You will see that the total number of schools to which grants have been made is 21. Out of this there are 13 Hindu institutions, 6 Sikh institutions and 2 Muslim institutions. The grant that goes to the Hindu institutions is Rs. 16,973, to Sikh institutions Rs. 9,908 and to Muslim institutions Rs. 2,200. The cause, therefore, of this remarkable phenomenon must be sought in the way in which money on education is spent.

---

---

<sup>1</sup> The Honourable Mr. (later Sir) Manohar Lal,

*PART TWO*

**ISLAM AND QADIANISM**

True toleration is begotten of intellectual breadth and spiritual expansion. It is the toleration of the spiritually powerful man who, while jealous of the frontiers of his own faith, can tolerate and even appreciate all forms of faith other than his own. Of this type of toleration the true Muslim alone is capable.



## QADIANIS AND ORTHODOX MUSLIMS

The issue created by the controversy between the Qadianis and the orthodox Muslims is extremely important. The Indian Muslims have only recently begun to realize its importance. I intended to address an open letter to the British people explaining the social and political implications of the issue. But unfortunately my health prevented me from doing so. I am, however, glad to say a few words for the present on a matter which, to my mind, affects the entire collective life of the Indian Muslims. It must however, be pointed out at the outset that I have no intention to enter into any theological argument. Nor do I mean to undertake a psychological analysis of the mind of the founder of the Qadiani movement; the former will not interest those for whom this statement is meant and the time for the latter has not yet arrived in India. My point of view is that of a student of general history and comparative religion.

India is a land of many religious communities; and Islam is a religious community in a much deeper sense than those communities whose structure is determined partly by the religious and partly by the race idea. Islam repudiates the race idea altogether and founds itself on the religious idea alone. Since Islam bases itself on the religious idea alone, a basis which is wholly spiritual and consequently far more

ethereal than blood relationship, Muslim society is naturally much more sensitive to forces which it considers harmful to its integrity. Any religious society historically arising from the bosom of Islam, which claims a new prophethood for its basis, and declares all Muslims who do not recognize the truth of its alleged revelation as *Kafirs*, must, therefore, be regarded by every Muslim as a serious danger to the solidarity of Islam. This must necessarily be so; since the integrity of Muslim society is secured by the idea of the Finality of Prophethood alone.

This idea of Finality is perhaps the most original idea in the cultural history of mankind; its true significance can be understood only by those who carefully study the history of pre-Islamic Magian culture in Western and Middle Asia. The concept of Magian culture, according to modern research, includes cultures associated with Zoroastrianism, Judaism, Jewish Christianity, Chaldean and Sabeian religions. To these creed-communities the idea of the continuity of prophethood was essential, and consequently they lived in a state of constant expectation. It is probable that the Magian man psychologically enjoyed this state of expectation. The modern man is spiritually far more emancipated than the Magian man. The result of the Magian attitude was the disintegration of old communities and the constant formation of new ones by all sorts of religious adventurers. In the modern world of Islam, ambitious and ignorant *mullaism* taking advantage of the modern Press, has shamelessly attempted to hurl the old pre-Islamic Magian outlook in the face of the twentieth century.

It is obvious that Islam which claims to weld all the various communities of the world into one single community cannot reconcile itself to a movement which threatens its present solidarity and holds the promise of further rifts in human society.

Of the two forms which the modern reviva of pre-Islamic Magianism has assumed, Bahaism appears to me to be far more honest than Qadianism ; for the former openly departs from Islam, whereas the latter apparently retains some of the more important externals of Islam with an inwardness wholly inimical to the spirit and aspirations of Islam. Its idea of a jealous God with an inexhaustible store of earthquakes and plagues for its opponents; its conception of the Prophet as a soothsayer ; its idea of the continuity of the spirit of Messiah, are so absolutely Jewish that the movement can easily be regarded as a return to early Judaism. The idea of the continuity of the spirit of Messiah belongs more to Jewish mysticism than to positive Judaism. Professor Buber who has given an account of the movement initiated by the Polish Messiah Baalshem tells us that "it was thought that the spirit of the Messiah descended upon the earth through the prophets and even through a long line of holy men stretching into the present time—the Zaddiks" (Sadiqs). Heretical movements in Muslim Iran under the pressure of pre-Islamic Magian ideas invented the words "buruz" "hujul", "zill" to cover this idea of a perpetual reincarnation. It was necessary to invent new expressions for a Magian idea in order to make it less shocking to Muslim conscience. Even

the phrase "promised Messiah" is not a product of Muslim religious consciousness. It is a bastard expression and has its origin in the pre-Islamic Magian outlook.

We do not find it in early Islamic religious and historical literature. This remarkable fact is revealed by Prof. Wensincks' "Concordance of the Traditions of the Holy Prophet" which covers no less than 11 collections of the traditions and 3 of the earliest historical documents of Islam. One can very well understand the reason why early Muslims never used this expression. The expression did not appeal to them probably because they thought that it implied a false conception of the historical process. The Magian mind regarded time as a circular movement; the glory of elucidating the true nature of the historical process as a perpetually creative movement was reserved for the great Muslim thinker and historian, Ibn Khaldun.

The intensity of feeling which the Indian Muslims have manifested in opposition to the Qadiani movement is, therefore, perfectly intelligible to the student of modern sociology. The average Muslim who was the other day described as "mulla-ridden" by a writer in the *Civil and Military Gazette*, is inspired in his opposition to the movement more by his instinct of self-preservation than by a fuller grasp of the meaning of the Idea of Finality in his faith. The so-called "enlightened" Muslim has seldom made an attempt to understand the real cultural significance of the idea of Finality in Islam, and a process of slow and imperceptible Westernization has further deprived him even of

the instinct of self-preservation. Some of these so-called enlightened Muslims have gone to the extent of preaching 'tolerance' to their brethren-in-faith. I can easily excuse Sir Herbert Emerson<sup>1</sup> for preaching toleration to Muslims; for a modern European who is born and brought up in an entirely different culture does not, and perhaps cannot, develop the insight which makes it possible for one to understand an issue vital to the very structure of a community with an entirely different cultural outlook.

In India circumstances are much more peculiar. This country of the religious communities where the future of each community rests entirely upon its solidarity, is ruled by a Western people who cannot but adopt a policy of non-interference in religion. This liberal and indispensable policy in a country like India has led to most unfortunate results. In so far as Islam is concerned, it is no exaggeration to say that the solidarity of the Muslim community in India under the British is far less safe than the solidarity of the Jewish community was in the days of Jesus under the Romans. Any religious adventurer in India can set up any claim and carve out a new community for his own exploitation. This liberal state of ours does not care a fig for the integrity of a parent community, provided the adventurer assures it of his loyalty and his followers are regular in the payment of taxes due to the state. The meaning of this policy for Islam was quite accurately seen by our great poet Akbar who, in his usual

---

<sup>1</sup>Governor of the Punjab.

humorous strain, says :

گورنمنٹ کی خیر با رو صفا انا الحق کہو اور پمانسی نہ پاؤ

"O friend ! pray for the glory of the Briton's name, Say 'I am God' *sans* chain, *sans* cross, *sans* shame."

I very much appreciate the orthodox Hindus' demand for protection against religious reformers in the new constitution. Indeed, the demand ought to have been first made by the Muslims who, unlike the Hindus, entirely eliminate the race idea from their social structure. The Government must seriously consider the present situation and try, if possible, to understand the mentality of the average Muslim in regard to this issue which he regards as absolutely vital to the integrity of his community. After all, if the integrity of a community is threatened, the only course open to that community is to defend itself against the forces of disintegration.

And what are the ways of self-defence ?

Controversial writings and refutations of the claims of the man who is regarded by the parent community as a religious adventurer. Is it then fair to preach toleration to the parent community whose integrity is threatened and to allow the rebellious group to carry on its propaganda with impunity, even when the propaganda is highly abusive ?

If a group, rebellious from the point of view of the parent community, happens to be of some special service to Government, the latter are at liberty to reward their services as best as they can. Other communities will not grudge it. But it is too much to expect that a community should calmly ignore the forces which tend seriously to affect its collective life.

Collective life is as sensitive to the danger of dissolution as individual life. It is hardly necessary to add in this connection that the mutual theological bickerings of Muslim sects do not affect vital principles on which all these sects agree with all their differences in spite of their mutual accusations of heresy.

There is one further point which demands Government's special consideration. The encouragement in India of religious adventurers on the ground of modern liberalism tends to make people more and more indifferent to religion and will eventually completely eliminate the important factor of religion from the life of Indian communities. The Indian mind will then seek some other substitute for religion, which is likely to be nothing less than the form of atheistic materialism which has appeared in Russia.

But the religious issue is not the only issue which is at present agitating the minds of the Punjab Muslims. There are other quarrels of a political nature to which, according to my reading, Sir Herbert Emerson hinted in his speech at the Anjuman's<sup>1</sup> anniversary. These are, no doubt, of a purely political nature, but they affect the unity of Punjab Muslims as seriously as the religious issue. While thanking the Government for their anxiety to see the Punjab Muslims united, I venture to suggest a little self-examination to the Government themselves. Who is responsible, I ask, for the distinction of rural and urban Muslims—a distinction which has cut up the Muslim community into two groups and the rural group into several sub-groups constantly at war with one another ?

---

<sup>1</sup>Anjuman Himayat-i-Islam, Lahore.

Sir Herbert Emerson deploras the lack of proper leadership among the Punjab Muslims. But I wish Sir Herbert Emerson realised that the rural-urban distinction created by the Government and maintained by them through ambitious political adventurers whose eyes are fixed on their own personal interests and not on the unity of Islam in the Punjab has already made the community incapable of producing a real leader. It appears to me that this device probably originated in a desire rather to make it impossible for real leadership to grow. Sir Herbert Emerson deploras the lack of leadership in Muslims ; I deplore the continuation by the Government of a system which has crushed out all hope of a real leader appearing in the province.

#### *POSTSCRIPT*

I understand that this statement has caused some misunderstanding in some quarters. It is thought that I have made a subtle suggestion to the Government to suppress the Qadiani movement by force. Nothing of the kind. I have made it clear that the policy of non-interference in religion is the only policy which can be adopted by the rulers of India. No other policy is possible. I confess, however, that to my mind this policy is harmful to the interests of religious communities ; but there is no escape from it and those who suffer will have to safeguard their interests by suitable means. The best course for the rulers of India is in my opinion, to declare the Qadianis a separate community. This will be perfectly consistent with the policy of the Qadianis themselves and the Indian Muslim will tolerate them just as he tolerates the other religions.



## II

### REJOINDER TO THE 'LIGHT'

[Criticising the foregoing statement, the *Light* (a Qadiani weekly) remarked : "Like some other great thinkers, he (Dr. Iqbal) does not believe in the communion of man with God through the instrumentality of what is known as verbal revelation." Interviewed by a Press representative about this accusation, Dr. Iqbal said :]

The *Light* bases its accusation on an Urdu verse of mine :

ہم کلامی ہے غیریت کی دلیل      خامشی پر مٹا ہوا ہرں میں

This is plain Urdu and only means that there is a higher stage in the spiritual life of man than verbal communion. But the verse has nothing to do with the doctrine of verbal revelation as a theological doctrine for which I must refer the *Light* to my *Reconstruction*<sup>1</sup> in which I wrote on page 21 :

The organic relation of feeling and idea throws light on the old theological controversy about verbal revelation which once gave so much trouble to Muslim religious thinkers. Inarticulate feeling seeks to fulfil its destiny in idea, which in its turn tends to develop out of itself in its own visible garment. It is no mere metaphor to say that idea and word both simultaneously emerge out of the womb of feeling, though logical understanding cannot but take them in a temporal order and then create its own difficulty by regarding them

<sup>1</sup>Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam : Published by Sh. Muhammad Ashraf, Lahore.

as mutually isolated. There is a sense in which the word is also revealed.

\* \* \* \* \*

[Questioned about the tradition quoted by the *Light* that *mujaddids* appear at the head of every century, Dr. Iqbal replied :]

The editor of the *Light* quotes a tradition which gives a mathematically exact picture of the historical process. While I do believe in man's spiritual capacity and the possibility of the birth of spiritual men, I am not sure that the historical process is so mathematical as the *Light* thinks. We can easily confess that it is beyond our intellectual capacity to understand the nature of the historical process. All that I can negatively say is that it does not appear to me to be as fixed and mathematically exact as the *Light* thinks. I am rather inclined to Ibn Khaldun's view which regards the historical process as a free creative movement and not a process which has already been worked out with definite landmarks. This view has been put forward in modern times by Bergson with much greater wealth of illustration and scientific accuracy than by Ibn Khaldun. The tradition quoted by the *Light* was probably popularised by Jalal-ud-Din Suyuti in his own interest and much importance cannot be attached to it. It is not mentioned in *Bukhari* and *Muslim*, the two books which are believed to be most reliable. It may embody a vision of the nature of the historical process by some spiritual men, but this personal vision of the individuals can form no basis for logical argument. This is the rule which expert traditionists have always observed.

\* \* \* \* \*

[Questioned whether he had seen a letter published in the *Sunrise* (another Qadiani weekly) in which the writer referred to a lecture of Dr. Iqbal and accused him of the inconsistency, the Doctor replied :]

Yes : I am sorry I have no copy of the lecture in question either in the original English or in the Urdu translation which was made by Maulana Zafar Ali Khan. As far as I remember, the lecture was delivered in 1911, or perhaps earlier. I have no hesitation in admitting that about a quarter of a century ago I had hopes of good results following from this movement. Earlier still, even that eminent Muslim, the late Maulvi Chiragh Ali, the author of several English books on Islam, co-operated with the founder of the movement and, I understand, made valuable contributions to the book called *Barahin-i-Ahmadiyya*. But the real content and spirit of a religious movement does not reveal itself in a day. It takes decades to unfold itself. The internal quarrels between the two sections of the movement is evidence of the fact that even those who were in personal contact with the founder were not quite aware of how the movement would evolve itself. Personally, I became suspicious of the movement when the claim of a new prophethood, superior even to the Prophethood of the Founder of Islam, was definitely put forward, and the Muslim world was declared *Kafir*. Later my suspicions developed into a positive revolt when I heard with my own ears an adherent of the movement

mentioning the Holy Prophet of Islam in a most disparaging language. Not by their roots but by their fruits will you know them. If my present attitude is self-contradictory, then, well, only a living and thinking man has the privilege of contradicting himself. Only stones do not contradict themselves, as Emerson says.

\* \* \* \* \*

[Questioned about the possibility of divine inspiration and the advent of inspired reformers after the Holy Prophet, Dr. Iqbal replied:]

I had better answer this question by referring, you to my *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam* in which I wrote on pages 120-21:

The idea of finality ... should not be taken to suggest that the ultimate fate of life is complete displacement of emotion by reason. Such a thing is neither possible nor desirable. The intellectual value of the idea that it ends to create an independent critical attitude towards mystic experience by generating the belief that personal authority, claiming a supernatural origin, has come to an end in the history of man. This kind of belief is a psychological force which inhibits the growth of such authority. The function of the idea is to open up fresh vistas of knowledge in the domain of man's inner experience. Just as the first half of the formula of Islam has created and fostered the spirit of critical observation of man's outer experience by divesting the forces of Nature of that divine character with which earlier cultures had clothed them. Mystic experience, then, however, unusual and abnormal, must

now be regarded by the Muslim as a perfectly natural experience, open to critical scrutiny like other aspects of human experience. This is clear from the Prophet's own attitude towards Ibn Sayyad's psychic experience. The function of Sufism in Islam has been to systematize mystic experience, though it must be admitted that Ibn Khaldun was the only Muslim who approached it in a thoroughly scientific spirit.

The opening sentence clearly shows that saints in the psychological sense of the word or men of saintly character will always appear. Whether Mirza Sahib belonged to this category or not is a separate question. Indeed, as long as the spiritual capacity of mankind endures, they will rise among all nations and countries in order to show better ideals of life to man. To hold otherwise would be to fly in the face of human experience. The only difference is that the modern man has the right to a critical examination of their mystic experiences. The Finality of the Prophecy means, among other things, that all personal authority in religious life, denial of which involves damnation, has come to an end.

\* \* \* \* \*

[Questioned about a letter published in the *Statesman* from Mr. Dinshaw, a Parsi gentleman, Dr. Iqbal said :]

I have got nothing to say about it, except that I fully agree with his main thesis that to the Iranian element belongs a very rich role in the external as well as the internal history of Islam. This Iranian influence is so extensive that Spengler has been

misled by Magian overlaying of Islam and has practically taken Islam for a Magian religion. In my *Reconstruction* I have made an attempt to divest Islam of its Magian encrustations and I hope to be able to do further work in this direction in my *Introduction to the Study of the Quran*<sup>1</sup>. Magian thought and religious experience very much permeate Muslim theology, philosophy and Sufism. Indeed there is evidence to show that certain schools of Sufism now known as Islamic have only repeated the Magian type of religious experience. I regard Magian culture as one form among other forms of human culture and did not use the term as a sort of stigma. It had its ruling concepts, its philosophical discussions, its truths and its errors. But when a culture begins to show signs of decay, its philosophical discussions, its concepts, and its forms of religious experience become fixed and immobile. It was at that time in the history of Magian culture that Islam appeared and, according to my reading of cultural history, entered a strong protest against that culture. There is definite evidence in the Quran itself to show that Islam aimed at opening up new channels not only of thought but of religious experience as well. Our Magian inheritance, however, has stifled the life of Islam and never allowed the development of its real spirit and aspirations.

---

<sup>1</sup>So far as we know this Introduction was never written.

## III

## A LETTER TO THE "STATESMAN"

[The *Statesman* published Dr. Iqbal's statement on "Qadianis and Orthodox Muslims" along with a criticism of it in the first leader. The following letter was in reply addressed to the *Statesman* and was published on June 10, 1935.]

I am very thankful to you for your critical leader on my statement which was published in your issue of the 14th May. The question which you have raised in your leader is a very important one, and I am really very glad that you have raised it. I did not raise it in my statement because I felt that, considering the separatist policy of the Qadianis which they have consistently persued in religious and social matters ever since the birth of the idea of building a new community on the foundations of a rival prophethood and the intensity of the Muslim feeling against this move, it was rather the duty of the Government to take administrative cognizance of such a fundamental difference between the Qadianis and the Muslims without waiting for a formal representation on behalf of the Muslim community of India. I was encouraged in this feeling by the Government's attitude in the matter of the Sikh community which till 1919 was not administratively regarded as a separate political unit but which was later treated as such without any formal representation on the part of the Sikhs, inspite of the Lahore High Court's finding that the Sikhs were Hindus.

However, now that you have raised this question

I should like to offer a few observations on a matter which I regard as of the highest importance both from the British and the Muslim points of view. You want me 'to make it perfectly clear whether when or where I can tolerate official cognizance of any one community's religious differences'. Let me point out :

First, that Islam is essentially a religious community with perfectly defined boundaries—belief in the Unity of God, belief in all the Prophets and belief in the Finality of Muhammad's Prophethood. The last mentioned belief is really the factor which accurately draws the line of demarcation between Muslims and non-Muslims and enables one to decide whether a certain individual or group is a part of the community or not. For example, the Brahmos believe in God, they also regard Muhammad (on whom be peace) as one of the prophets of God, yet they cannot be regarded as part and parcel of Islam because they, like the Qadianis, believe in the theory of perpetual revelation through prophets and do not believe in the Finality of Prophethood in Muhammad. No Islamic sect, as far as I know, has ever ventured to cross this line of demarcation. The Bahais in Iran have openly rejected the principle of Finality but have at the same time frankly admitted that they are a new community and not Muslims in the technical sense of the word. According to our belief Islam as a religion was revealed by God, but the existence of Islam as a society or nation depends entirely on the personality of the Holy Prophet. In my opinion, only two courses are open to the Qadianis,



either frankly to follow the Bahais or to ~~cashaw~~ their interpretations of the idea of Finality in Islam and to accept the idea with all its implications. Their diplomatic interpretations are dictated merely by a desire to remain within the fold of Islam for obvious political advantages.

Secondly, we must not forget the Qadianis' own policy and their attitude towards the world of Islam. The founder of the movement described the parent community as "rotten milk" and his own followers as "fresh milk", warning the latter against mixing with the former. Further, their denial of fundamentals their giving themselves a new name (Ahmadis) as a community, their non-participation in the congregational prayers of Islam, their social boycott of Muslims in the matter of matrimony, etc. and above all their declaration that the entire world of Islam is *Kafir*—all these things constitute an unmistakable declaration of separation by the Qadianis themselves. Indeed, the facts mentioned above clearly show that they are far more distant from Islam than Sikhs from Hinduism, for the Sikhs at least intermarry with the Hindus, even though they do not worship in the Hindu temples.

Thirdly, it does not require any special intelligence to see why the Qadianis, while pursuing a policy of separation in religious and social matters, are anxious to remain politically within the fold of Islam. Apart from the political advantages in the sphere of Government service which accrue to them by remaining within the fold of Islam, it is obvious that in view of their present population, which,

according to the last census, is fifty-six thousand only, they are not entitled even to a single seat in any legislature of the country and cannot, therefore, be regarded as a political minority in the sense in which you seem to be using the expression. The fact that the Qadianis have not so far asked for separation as a distinct political unit shows that in their present position they do not find themselves entitled to any representation in legislative bodies. The new constitution is not without provisions for the protection of such minorities. To my mind, it is clear that in the matter of approaching the Government for separation the Qadianis will never take the initiative. The Muslim community is perfectly justified in demanding their immediate separation from the parent community. If the Government does not immediately agree to this demand, the Indian Muslims, will be driven to the suspicion that the British Government is keeping the new religion in store, as it were, and delaying the separation because in view of the small number of its adherents it is, for the present, incapable of functioning as a fourth community in the province which may effectively damage the already marginal majority of Punjab Muslims in the local legislature. The Government did not wait for a formal representation for separation by the Sikhs in 1919: why should they wait for a formal representation by the Qadianis ?

---

## IV

REPLY TO QUESTIONS RAISED BY  
PANDIT J. L. NEHRU

On the appearance of Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru's three articles in the *Modern Review* of Calcutta I received a number of letters from Muslims of different shades of religious and political opinion. Some writers of these letters want me further to elucidate and justify the attitude of the Indian Muslims towards the Ahmadis. Others ask me what exactly I regard as the issue involved in Ahmadism. In this statement I propose first to meet these demands which I regard as perfectly legitimate, and then to answer the questions raised by Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru. I fear, however, that parts of this statement may not interest the Pandit, and to save his time I suggest that he may skip over such parts.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that I welcome the Pandit's interest in what I regard as one of the greatest problems of the East and perhaps of the whole world. He is, I believe, the first nationalist Indian leader who has expressed a desire to understand the present spiritual unrest in the world of Islam. In view of the many aspects and possible reactions of this unrest it is highly desirable that thoughtful Indian political leaders should open their minds to the real meaning of what is, at the present movement, agitating the heart of Islam.

I do not wish, however, to conceal the fact either from the Pandit or from any other reader of this statement that the Pandit's articles have for the

moment given my mind rather a painful conflict of feelings. Knowing him to be a man of wide cultural sympathies, I cannot but incline to the view that his desire to understand the questions he has raised is perfectly genuine ; yet the way in which he has expressed himself betrays a psychology which I find difficult to attribute to him. I am inclined to think that my statement<sup>1</sup> on Qadianism=no more than a mere exposition of a religious doctrine on modern lines—has embarrassed both the Pandit and the Qadianis, perhaps because both inwardly resent, for different reasons, the prospects of Muslim political and religious solidarity, particularly in India. It is obvious that the Indian nationalist whose political idealism has practically killed his sense for fact, is intolerant of the birth of a desire for self-determination in the heart of north-west Indian Islam. He thinks, wrongly in my opinion, that the only way to Indian nationalism lie in a total suppression of the cultural entities of the country though the interaction of which alone India can evolve a rich and enduring culture. A nationalism achieved by such methods can mean nothing but mutual bitterness and even oppression. It is equally obvious that the Qadianis, too, feel nervous by the political awakening of the Indian muslims, because they feel that the rise in political prestige of the Indian Muslims is sure to defeat their designs to carve out from the *umma* of the Arabian Prophet a new *umma* for the Indian prophet. It is no small surprise to me that my effort to impress on the Indian Muslims the extreme necessity of internal

---

<sup>1</sup>Ivide pages 93—103 ante.

cohesion in the present critical moment of their history in India, and my warning them against the forces of disintegration, masquerading as reformist movements, should have given the Pandit an occasion to sympathize with such forces.

However, I do not wish to pursue the unpleasant task of analyzing the Pandit's motives. For the benefit of those who want further elucidation of the general Muslim attitude towards the Qadianis, I would quote a passage from Durant's *Story of Philosophy* which, I hope, will give the reader a clear idea of the issue involved in Qadianism. Durant has in a few sentences summed up the Jewish point of view in the excommunication of the great philosopher, Spinoza. The reader must not think that in quoting this passage I mean to insinuate some sort of comparison between Spinoza and the founder of Ahmadism. The distance between them, both in point of intellect and character, is simply tremendous. The "God-intoxicated" Spinoza never claimed that he was the centre of a new organization and that all the Jews who did not believe in him were outside the pale of Judaism. Durant's passage, therefore, applies with much greater force to the attitude of Muslims towards Qadianism than to the attitude of the Jews towards the excommunication of Spinoza. The passage is as follows :

"Furthermore, religious unanimity seemed to the elders their sole means of preserving the little Jewish group in Amsterdam from disintegration, and almost the last means of preserving the unity, and so ensuring the survival, of the scattered Jews of the world. If they had had their own state,

their own civil law, their own establishments of secular force and power, to compel internal cohesion and external respect, they might have been more tolerant; but their religion was to them their patriotism as well as their faith; the synagogue was their centre of social and political life as well as of ritual and worship; and the Bible, whose veracity Spinoza had impugned, the "portable fatherland" of their people; under the circumstances they thought heresy was treason, and toleration suicide."

Situated as the Jews were—a minority community in Amsterdam—they were perfectly justified in regarding Spinoza as a disintegrating factor threatening the dissolution of their community. Similarly the Indian Muslims are right in regarding the Qadiani movement, which declares the entire world of Islam as *Kafir* and socially boycotts them, to be far more dangerous to the collective life of Islam in India than the metaphysics of Spinoza to the collective life of the Jews. The Indian Muslim, I believe, instinctively realizes the peculiar nature of the circumstances in which he is placed in India and is naturally much more sensitive to the forces of disintegration than the Muslims of any other country. This instinctive <sup>and very deep</sup> perception of the average Muslim in my opinion is absolutely correct and has, I have no doubt, a much deeper foundation in the conscience of Indian Islam. Those who talk of toleration in a matter like this are extremely careless in using the word "toleration" which, I fear, they do not understand at all. The spirit of toleration may arise from very different attitudes of

the mind of man. As Gibbon would say : "There is the toleration of the philosopher to whom all religions are equally true; of the historian to whom all are equally false; and of the politician to whom all are equally useful. There is the toleration of the man who tolerates other modes of thought and behaviour because he has himself grown absolutely indifferent to all modes of thought and behaviour. There is the toleration of the weak man who, on account of sheer weakness, must pocket all kinds of insult: heaped on things or persons that he holds dear." It is obvious that these types of tolerance have no ethical value. On the other hand, they unmistakably reveal the spiritual impoverishment of the man who practises them. True toleration is begotten of intellectual breadth and spiritual expansion. It is the toleration of the spiritually powerful man who, while jealous of the frontiers of his own faith, can tolerate and even appreciate all forms of faith other than his own. Of this type of toleration the true Muslim alone is capable. His own faith is synthetic and for this reason he can easily find grounds of sympathy and appreciation in other faiths. Our great Indian poet, Amir Khusro, beautifully brings out the essence of this type of toleration in the story of an idol-worshipper. After giving an account of his intense attachment to his idols the poet addresses his Muslim readers as follows :

اے کہ آیت طعمہ بہ ہندوہری  
ہم زوے آموز پرستش کری

Only a true lover of God can appreciate the value of devotion even though it is directed to gods in

which he himself does not believe. The folly of our preachers of toleration consists in describing the attitude of the man who is jealous of the boundaries of his own faith as one of intolerance. They wrongly consider this attitude as a sign of moral inferiority. They do not understand that the value of his attitude is essentially biological, where the members of a group feel, either instinctively or on the basis of rational argument, that the corporate life of the social organism to which they belong is in danger, their defensive attitude must be appraised in reference mainly to a biological criterion. Every thought or deed in this connection must be judged by the life value that it may possess. The question in this case is not whether the attitude of an individual or community towards the man who is declared to be a heretic is morally good or bad. The question is whether it is life-giving or life-destroying. Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru seems to think that a society founded on religious principles necessitates the institution of Inquisition. This is indeed true of the history of Christianity; but the history of Islam, contrary to the Pandit's logic, shows that during the last thirteen hundred years of the life of Islam, the institution of Inquisition has been absolutely unknown in Muslim countries. The Quran expressly prohibits such an institution. "Do not seek out the shortcomings of others and carry not tales against your brethren." Indeed the Pandit will find from the history of Islam that the Jews and Christians, fleeing from religious persecution in their own lands, always found shelter in the lands of Islam. The two



propositions on which the conceptual structure of Islam is based are so simple that it makes heresy in the sense of turning the heretic outside the fold of Islam almost impossible. It is true that when a person declared to be holding heretical doctrines threatens the existing social order, an independent Muslim state will certainly take action; but in such a case the action of the state will be determined more by political considerations than by purely religious ones. I can very well realize that a man like the Pandit, who is born and brought up in a society which has no well-defined boundaries and consequently no internal cohesion, finds it difficult to conceive that a religious society can live and prosper without state-appointed commissions of enquiry into the beliefs of the people. This is quite clear from the passage which he quotes from Cardinal Newman and wonders how far I would accept the application of the Cardinal's dictum to Islam. Let me tell him that there is a tremendous difference between the inner structure of Islam and Catholicism wherein the complexity, the ultra-rational character and the number of dogmas has, as the history of Christianity shows, always fostered possibilities of fresh heretical interpretations. The simple faith of Muhammad is based on two propositions—that God is One, and that Muhammad is the last of the line of those holy men who have appeared from time to time in all countries and in all ages to guide mankind to the right ways of living. If, as some Christian writers think, a dogma must be defined as an ultra-rational proposition which, for the purpose of securing

religious solidarity, must be assented to without any understanding of its metaphysical import, then these two simple propositions of Islam cannot be described even as dogmas; for both of them are supported by the experience of mankind and are fairly amenable to rational argument. The question of a heresy, which needs the verdict, whether the author of it is within or without the fold, can arise, in the case of a religious society founded on such simple proposition, only when the heretic rejects both or either of these propositions. Such heresy must be and has been rare in the history of Islam which while jealous of its frontiers, permits freedom of interpretation within these frontiers. And since the phenomenon of the kind of heresy which affects the boundaries of Islam has been rare in the history of Islam, the feeling of the average Muslim is naturally intense when a revolt of this kind arises. This is why the feeling of Muslim Iran was so intense against the Bahais. That is why the feeling of the Indian Muslims is so intense against the Qadianis,

It is true that mutual accusations of heresy for differences in minor points of law and theology among Muslim religious sects have been rather common. In this indiscriminate use of the word *kufir* both for minor theological points of difference as well as for the extreme cases of heresy which involve the excommunication of the heretic, some present-day educated Muslims, who possess practically no knowledge of the history of Muslim theological disputes, see a sign of social and political disintegration of the Muslim community. This, however, is an entirely

wrong notion. The history of Muslim theology shows that natural accusation of heresy on minor points of difference has, far from working as a disruptive force, actually given an impetus to synthetic theological thought. "When we read the history of development of Mohammadan law," says Prof. Hurgrounje, "we find that, on the one hand, the doctors of every age, on the slightest stimulus, condemn one another to the point of mutual accusations of heresy; and, on the other hand, the very same people with greater and greater unity of purpose try to reconcile the similar quarrels of their predecessors." The student of Muslim theology knows that among Muslim legists this kind of heresy is technically known as "heresy below heresy," i. e., the kind of heresy which does not involve the excommunication of the culprit. It may be admitted, however, that in the hands of *mullas*, whose intellectual laziness takes all oppositions of theological thought as absolute and is consequently blind to the unity in difference, this minor heresy may become a source of great mischief. This mischief can be remedied only by giving to the students of our theological schools a clearer vision of the synthetic spirit of Islam, and by reinitiating them into the function of logical contradiction as a principle of movement in theological dialectic." The question of what may be called major heresy arises only when the teaching of a thinker or a reformer affects the frontiers of the faith of Islam. Unfortunately this question does arise in connection with the teachings of Qadianism. It must be pointed out here that the Ahmadi movement is divided into two camps, known

as the Qadianis and the Lahoris. The former openly declare the founder to be a full prophet; the latter, either by conviction or policy, have found it advisable to preach an apparently toned down Qadianism. However, the question whether the founder of Ahmadism was a prophet, the denial of whose mission entails what I call the "major heresy", is a matter of dispute between the two sections. It is unnecessary for my purposes to judge the merits of this domestic controversy of the Ahmadis. I believe for reasons to be explained presently, that the idea of a full prophet whose denial entails the denier's excommunication from Islam is essential to Ahmadism; and that the present head of the Qadianis is far more consistent with the spirit of the movement than the Imam of the Lahoris.

The cultural value of the Idea of Finality in Islam I have fully explained elsewhere. Its meaning is simple: No spiritual surrender to any human being after Muhammad who emancipated his followers by giving them a law which is realizable as arising from the very core of human conscience. Theologically the doctrine is that the socio-political organization called "Islam" is perfect and eternal. No revelation, the denial of which entails heresy, is possible after Muhammad. He who claims such a revelation is a traitor to Islam. Since the Qadianis believe the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement to be the bearer of such a revelation, they declare that the entire world of Islam is infidel. The founders's own argument, quite worthy of a mediæval theologian, is that the spirituality of the Holy Prophet of Islam must

be regarded as imperfect if it is not creative of another prophet. He claims his own prophethood to be an evidence of the prophet-rearing power of the spirituality of the Holy Prophet of Islam. But if you further ask him whether the spirituality of Muhammad is capable of rearing more prophets than one, his answer is "No." This virtually amounts to saying: "Muhammad is not the last Prophet; I am the last." Far from understanding the cultural value of the Islamic idea of Finality in the history of mankind generally and of Asia especially, he thinks that Finality in the sense that no follower of Muhammad can ever reach the status of prophethood is a mark of imperfection in Muhammad's Prophethood. As I read the psychology of his mind he, in the interest of his own claim to prophethood, avails himself of what he describes as the creative spirituality of the Holy Prophet of Islam and at the same time deprives the Holy Prophet of his Finality by limiting the creative capacity of his spirituality to the rearing of only one prophet, i.e., the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement. In this way does the new prophet quietly steal away the Finality of one whom he claims to be his spiritual progenitor.

He claims to be *buruz* (بروز) of the Holy Prophet of Islam <sup>to enter gently</sup> insinuating thereby that being a *buruz* of his, his 'finality' is virtually the Finality of Muhammad; and that this view of the matter, therefore, does not violate the Finality of the Holy Prophet. In identifying the two finalities, his own and that of the Holy Prophet, he conveniently loses sight of the temporal meaning of the idea of finality. It is, however,

obvious that the word *buruz* in the sense even of complete likeness, cannot help him at all; for the *buruz* must always remain the other side of its original. Only in the sense of reincarnation a *buruz* becomes identical with the original. Thus if we take the word *buruz* to mean "like in spiritual qualities" the argument remains ineffective; if, on the other hand, we take it to mean reincarnation of the original in the Aryan sense of the word, the argument becomes plausible; but its author turns out to be only a Magian in disguise.

It is further claimed on the authority of the great Muslim mystic, Muhyuddin Ibn-al-'Arabi of Spain, that it is possible for a Muslim saint to attain, in his spiritual evolution, to the kind of experience characteristic of the prophetic consciousness. I personally believe this view of Sheikh Muhyuddin Ibn-al-'Arabi to be psychologically unsound; but assuming it to be correct, the Qadiani argument is based on a complete misunderstanding of his exact position. The Sheikh regards it as a purely private achievement which does not, and in the nature of things cannot, entitle such a saint to declare that all those who do not believe in him are outside the pale of Islam. Indeed, from the Sheikh's point of view, there may be more than one saint, living in the same age or country, who may attain to prophetic consciousness. The point to be seized is that while it is psychologically possible for a saint to attain to prophetic experience, his experience will have no socio-political significance making him the centre of a new organization and entitling him to declare this

organization to be the criterion of the faith or disbelief of the followers of Muhammad.

Leaving his mystical psychology aside I am convinced from a careful study of the relevant passages of the *Futuhaf* that the great Spanish mystic is as firm a believer in the Finality of Muhammad as any orthodox Muslim. And if he had seen in his mystical vision that one day in the East some Indian amateur in Sufism would seek to destroy the Holy Prophet's Finality under the cover of the mystical psychology, he would have certainly anticipated the Indian *ulama* in warning the Muslims of the world against such traitors to Islam.

Coming now to the essence of Ahmadism. A discussion of its sources and of the way in which pre-Islamic Magian ideas have, through the channels of Islamic mysticism, worked on the mind of its author would be extremely interesting from the standpoint of comparative religion. It is, however, impossible for me to undertake this discussion here. Suffice it to say that the real nature of Ahmadism is hidden behind the mist of mediæval mysticism and theology. The Indian *ulama*, therefore, took it to be a purely theological movement and came out with theological weapons to deal with it, I believe, however, that this was not the proper method of dealing with the movement; and that the success of the *ulama* was, therefore, only partial. A careful psychological analysis of the revelations of the founder would perhaps be an effective method of dissecting the inner life of his personality. In this connection I may mention Maulvi Manzoor Elahi's collection of the founder's revelations

which offer rich and varied material for psychological research. In my opinion the book provides a key to the character and personality of the founder : and I do hope that one day some young student of modern psychology will take it up for serious study. If he takes the Quran for his criterion, as he must for reasons which cannot be explained here, and extends his study to a comparative examination of the experiences of the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement and contemporary non-Muslim mystics, such as Ram Krishna of Bengal, he is sure to meet more than one surprise as to the essential character of the experience on the basis of which prophethood is claimed for the originator of Ahmadism.

Another equally effective and more fruitful method, from the standpoint of the plain man, is to understand the real content of Ahmadism in the light of the history of Muslim theological thought in India, at least from the year 1799. The year 1799 is extremely important in the history of the world of Islam. In this year fell Tippu and his fall meant the extinguishment of Muslim hopes for political prestige in India. In the same year was fought the battle of Navarino which saw the destruction of the Turkish fleet. Prophetic were the words of the author of the chronogram of Tippu's fall which visitors of Serangapatam find engraved on the wall of Tippu's mausoleum :

"Gone is the glory of Ind as well as of Roum."

Thus in the year 1799 the political decay of Islam in Asia reached its climax. But just as out of the humiliation of Germany on the day of Jena arose the modern



German nation, it may be said with equal truth that out of the political humiliation of Islam in the year 1799 arose modern Islam and her problems. This point I shall explain in the sequel. For the present I want to draw the reader's attention to some of the questions which have arisen in Muslim India since the fall of Tippu and the development of European imperialism in Asia.

Does the idea of Caliphate in Islam embody a religious instructions? How are the Indian Muslims, and for the matter of that all Muslims outside the Turkish Empire, related to the Turkish Caliphate? Is India *Dar-ul-Harb* or *Dar-ul-Islam*? What is the real meaning of the doctrine of *Jihad* in Islam? What is the meaning of the expression "from amongst you" in the Quranic verse: "Obey God, obey the Prophet and the masters of the affairs (*i.e.*, rulers) from amongst you?" What is the character of the tradition of the Prophet foretelling the advent of Imam Mehdi? These questions and some others which arose subsequently were, for obvious reasons, questions for Indian Muslims only. European imperialism, however, which was then rapidly penetrating the world of Islam was also intimately interested in them. The controversies which these questions created form a most interesting chapter in the history of Islam in India. The story is a long one and is still waiting for a powerful pen. Muslim politicians whose eyes were mainly fixed on the realities of the situation succeeded in winning over a section of the *ulama* to adopt a line of theological arguments which, as they thought, suited the situation; but it was not easy to conquer by

mere logic the beliefs which had ruled for centuries the conscience of the masses of Islam in India. In such a situation logic can either proceed on the ground of political expediency or on the lines of a fresh orientation of texts and traditions. In either case the argument will fail to appeal to the masses. To the intensely religious masses of Islam only one thing can make a conclusive appeal, and that is divine authority. For an effective eradication of orthodox beliefs it was found necessary to find a revelational basis for a politically suitable orientation of theological doctrines involved in the questions mentioned above. This revolutionary basis is provided by Ahmadiism. And the Ahmadis themselves claim this to be the greatest service rendered by them to British imperialism. The prophetic claim to a revolutionary basis for theological views of a political significance amounts to declaring that those who do not accept the claimant's views are infidels of the first water and destined for the flames of hell. As I understand the significance of the movement, the Ahmadi belief that Christ died the death of an ordinary mortal, and that his second advent means only the advent of a person who is spiritually 'like unto him,' gives the movement some sort of a rational appearance; but they are not really essential to the spirit of the movement. In my opinion they are only preliminary steps towards the idea of full prophethood which alone can serve the purposes of the movement eventually brought into being by new political forces. In primitive countries it is not logic but authority that appeals. Given a sufficient amount of ignorance, credulity

which strangely enough sometimes co-exists with good intelligence, and a person sufficiently audacious to declare himself a recipient of divine revelation whose denial would entail eternal damnation, it is easy, in a subject Muslim country, to invent a political theology and to build a community whose creed is political servility. And in the Punjab even all ill-woven net of vogue theological expressions can easily capture the innocent peasant who has been for centuries exposed to all kinds of exploitation. Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru advises the orthodox of all religions to unite and thus not to delay the coming of what he conceives to be Indian' nationalism. This ironical advice assumes that Ahmadism is a reform-movement; he does not know that as far as Islam in India is concerned' Ahmadism involves both religious and political issues of the highest importance.' As I have explained above, the function of Ahmadism in the history of Muslim religious thought is to furnish a revelational basis for India's present political subjugation. Leaving aside the purely religious issues, on the ground of political issues alone, I think, it does not lie in the mouth of a man like Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru to accuse Indian Muslims of reactionary conservatism. I have no doubt that if he had grasped the real nature of Ahmadism he would have very much appreciated the attitude of Indian Muslims towards a religious movement which claims divine authority for the woes of India. *still a living pale pallor*

Thus the reader will see that the pallor of Ahmadism which we find on the cheeks of Indian Islam today is not an abrupt phenomenon in the history of

Muslim religious thought in India. The ideas which eventually shaped themselves in the form of this movement became prominent in theological discussions long before the founder of Ahmadism was born. Nor do I mean to insinuate that the founder of Ahmadism and his companions deliberately planned their programme. I dare say the founder of the Ahmadiyya movement did hear a voice; but whether this voice came from the God of Life and Power or arose out of the spiritual impoverishment of the people must depend upon the nature of the movement which it has created and the kind of thought and emotion which it has given to those who have listened to it. The reader must not think that I am using metaphorical language. The life-history of nations shows that when the tide of life in a people begins to ebb, decadence itself becomes a source of inspiration, inspiring their poets, philosophers, saints, statesmen, and turning them into a class of apostles whose side ministry is to glorify, by the force of a seductive art of logic, all that is ignoble and ugly in the life of their people. These apostles unconsciously clothe despair in the glittering garment of hope, undermine the traditional values of conduct and thus destroy the spiritual virility of those who happen to be their victims. One can only imagine the rotten state of a people's will who are, on the basis of divine authority, made to accept their political environment as final. Thus all the actors who participated in the drama of Ahmadism were, I think, only innocent instruments in the hands of decadence. A similar drama had already been acted in Iran; but it did not lead, and could not have led,

to the religious and political issues which Ahmadism has created for Islam in India. Russia offered tolerance to Bapism and allowed the Babis to open their first missionary centre in Ishaqabad. England showed Ahmadis the same tolerance in allowing them to open their first missionary centre in Working. Whether Russia and England showed this tolerance on the ground of imperial expediency or pure broad-mindedness is difficult for us to decide. This much is absolutely clear that this tolerance has created difficult problems for Islam in Asia. In view of the structure of Islam, as I understand it, I have not the least doubt in my mind that Islam will emerge purer out of the difficulties thus created for her. Times are changing. Things in India have already taken a new turn. The new spirit of democracy which is coming to India is sure to disillusion the Ahmadis and to convince them of the absolute futility of their theological invention.

Nor will Islam tolerate any revival of mediæval mysticism which has already robbed its followers of their healthy instincts and given them only obscure thinking in return. It has, during the course of the past centuries, absorbed the best minds of Islam leaving the affairs of the state to mere mediocrities. Modern Islam cannot afford to repeat the experiment. Nor can it tolerate a repetition of the Punjab experiment of keeping Muslims occupied for half a century in theological problems which had absolutely no bearing on life. Islam has already passed into the broad daylight of fresh thought and experience: and no saint or prophet can bring it back to the fogs of

medieval mysticism.

Let me now turn to Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru's questions. I fear the Pandit's articles reveal practically no acquaintance with Islam or its religious history during the nineteenth century. Nor does he seem to have read what I have already written on the subject of his questions. It is not possible for me to reproduce here all that I have written before. Nor is it possible to write here a religious history of Islam in the nineteenth century without which a thorough understanding of the present situation in the world of Islam is impossible. Hundreds of books and articles have been written on Turkey and modern Islam. I have read most of this literature and probably the Pandit has also read it. I assure him, however, that not one of these writers understands the nature of the effect or of the cause that has brought about that effect. It is, therefore, necessary to briefly indicate the main currents of Muslim thought in Asia during the nineteenth century.

I have said above that in the year 1799 the political decay of Islam reached its climax. There can, however, be no greater testimony to the inner vitality of Islam than the fact that it practically took no time to realize its position in the world. During the nineteenth century were born Sir Syed Ahmad Khan in India, Syed Jamal-ud-Din Afghani in Afghanistan and Mufti Alam Jan in Russia. These men were probably inspired by Muhammad Ibn Abdul Wabab who was born in Nejd in 1700, the founder of the so-called Wahabi movement which may fairly be described as the first throb of life in modern Islam. The influence

of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan remained on the whole confined to India. It is probable, however, that he was the first modern Muslim to catch a glimpse of the positive character of the age which was coming. The remedy for the ills of Islam proposed by him, as by Mufti Alam Jan in Russia, was modern education. But the real greatness of the man consists in the fact that he was the first Indian Muslim who felt the need of a fresh orientation of Islam and worked for it. We may differ from his religious views, but there can be no denying the fact that his sensitive soul was the first to react to the modern age.

The extreme conservatism of Indian Muslims which had lost its hold on the realities of life failed to see the real meaning of the religious attitude of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan. In the North-West of India, a country more primitive and more saint-ridden than the rest of India, the Syed's movement was soon followed by the reaction of Ahmadism—a strange mixture of Semitic and Aryan mysticism with whom spiritual revival consists not in the purification of the individual's inner life according to the principles of the old Islamic Sufism, but in satisfying the expectant attitude of the masses by providing a 'promised Messiah'. The function of this 'promised Messiah' is not to extricate the individual from an enervating present but to make him slavishly surrender his ego to its dictates. This reaction carries within itself a very subtle contradiction. It retains the discipline of Islam but destroys the will which that discipline was intended to fortify.

Maulana Syed Jamal-ud-Din Afghani was a man

of a different stamp. Strange are the ways of Providence. One of the most advanced Muslims of our time, both in religious thought and action, was born in Afghanistan! A perfect master of nearly all the Muslim languages of the world and endowed with the most winning eloquence, his restless soul migrated from one Muslim country to another influencing some of the most prominent men in Iran, Egypt and Turkey. Some of the greatest theologians of our time, such as Mufti Muhammad 'Abduhu, and some of the men of younger generation who later became political leaders, such as Zaghlul Pasha of Egypt, were his disciples. He wrote little, spoke much and thereby transformed into miniature Jamal-ud-Din all those who came into contact with him. He never claimed to be a prophet or a renewer; yet no other man in our time has stirred the soul of Islam more deeply than he! His spirit is still working in the world of Islam and nobody knows where it will end.

It may, however, be asked what exactly was the objective of these great Muslims. The answer is that they found the world of Islam ruled by three main forces and they concentrated their whole energy on creating a revolt against these forces :

(i) *Mullaism*.—The *ulama* have always been a source of great strength to Islam. But during the course of centuries, especially since the destruction of Baghdad, they became extremely conservative and would not allow any freedom of *Ijtihad*, i.e., the forming of independent judgement in matters of law. The Wahabi movement which was a source of inspiration to the nineteenth century Muslim reformers was really a



revolt against this rigidity of the *ulama*. Thus the first [objective] of the nineteenth century Muslim reformers was a fresh orientation of the faith and a freedom to reinterpret the law in the light of advancing experience.

(ii) *Mysticism*.—The masses of Islam were swayed by the kind of mysticism which <sup>abolished the world</sup> blinked actualities, enervated the people and kept them steeped in all kinds of superstition. From its high state as a force of spiritual education, mysticism had fallen down to a mere means of exploiting the ignorance and the credulity of the people. It gradually and invisibly unnerved the will of Islam and softened it to the extent of seeking relief from the rigorous discipline of the law of Islam. The nineteenth century reformers rose in revolt against this mysticism and called Muslims to the broad daylight of the modern world. Not that they were materialists. Their mission was to open the eye of the Muslims to the spirit of Islam which aimed at the conquest of matter and not flight from it.

(iii) *Muslim Kings*.—The gaze of Muslim kings was solely fixed on their own dynastic interests and so long as these were protected, they did not hesitate to sell their countries to the highest bidder. To prepare the masses of Muslims for a revolt against such a state of things in the world of Islam was the special mission of Syed Jamal-ud-Din Afghani.

It is not possible here to give a detailed account of the transformation which these reformers brought about in the world of Muslim thought and feeling. One thing, however, is clear. They prepared to a great extent the ground for another set of men, i.e.,

Zaghlul Pasha, Mustafa Kamal and Raza Shah. The reformers interpreted, argued and explained; but the set of men who came after them, although inferior in academic learning, were men who, relying on their healthy instincts, had the courage to rush into sun-lit space and do, even by force, what the new conditions of life demanded. Such men are liable to make mistakes; but the history of nations shows that even their mistakes have sometimes borne good fruit. In them it is not logic but life that struggles restlessly to solve its own problems. It may be pointed out here that Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Syed Jamal-ud-Din Afghani and hundreds of the latter's disciples in Muslim countries were not Westernized Muslims. They were men who had sat on their knees before the *mullas* of the old school and had breathed the very intellectual and spiritual atmosphere which they later sought to reconstruct. Pressure of modern ideas may be admitted; but the history thus briefly indicated above clearly shows that the upheaval which has come to Turkey and which is likely, sooner or later, to come to other Muslim countries, is almost wholly determined by the forces within. It is only the superficial observer of the modern world of Islam who thinks that the present crisis in the world of Islam is wholly due to the working of alien forces.

Has then the world of Islam outside India, especially Turkey, abandoned Islam? Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru thinks that Turkey had ceased to be a Muslim country. He does not seem to realize that the question whether a person or a community has ceased to be a member of Islam is, from the Muslim point of view, a purely legal

question and must be decided in view of the structural principles of Islam. As long as a person is loyal to the two basic principles of Islam, *i.e.*, the Unity of God and Finality of the Holy Prophet, not even the strictest *mulla* can turn him outside the pale of Islam even though his interpretations of the law or of the text of the Quran are believed to be erroneous. But perhaps Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru has in his mind the supposed or real innovations which the Ataturk has introduced. Let us for a moment examine these. Is the development of a general materialist outlook in Turkey which seems inimical to Islam? Islam has had too much of renunciation; it is time for the Muslims to look to realities. Materialism is a bad weapon against religion; but it is quite an effective one against *mulla*-craft and Sufi-craft which deliberately mystify the people with a view to exploit their ignorance and credulity. The spirit of Islam is not afraid of its contact with matter. Indeed the Quran says: "Forget not thy share in the world." It is difficult for a non-Muslim to understand that, considering the history of the Muslim world during the last few centuries, the progress of a materialist outlook is only a form of self-realization. Is it then the abolition of the old dress or the introduction of the Latin script? Islam as a religion has no country; as a society it has no specific language, no specific dress. Even the recitation of the Quran in Turkish is not without some precedent in Muslim history. Personally I regard it as a serious error of judgement; for the modern student of the Arabic language and literature knows full well that the only non-European language which has

future is Arabic. But the reports are that the Turks have already abandoned the vernacular recitation of the Quran. Is it then the abolition of polygamy or the licentiate *ulama*? According to the law of Islam the Amir of Muslim state has the power to revoke the "permissions" of the law if he is convinced that they tend to cause social corruption. As to the licentiate *ulama* I would certainly introduce it in Muslim India if I had the power to do so. To the inventions of the myth-making *mulla* is largely due to the stupidity of the average Muslim. In excluding him from the religious life of the people the Ataturk has done what would have delighted the heart of an Ibn Taimiyya or Shah Wali Ullah. There is a tradition of the Holy Prophet reported in the *Mishkat* to the effect that only the Amir of the Muslim state and the persons appointed by him are entitled to preach to the people. I do not know whether the Ataturk ever knew of this tradition; yet it is striking how the light of his Islamic conscience has illumined the zone of his action in this important matter. The adoption of the Swiss code with its rule of inheritance is certainly a serious error which has arisen out of the youthful zeal for reform excusable in a people furiously desiring to go ahead. The joy of emancipation from the fetters of a long-standing priest-craft sometimes drives a people to untried courses of action. But Turkey as well as the rest of the world of Islam has yet to realize the hitherto unrevealed economic aspects of the Islamic law of inheritance which Von Kremer describes as the "supremely original branch of Muslim law." Is it the abolition of the Caliphate or the separation of

church and state? In its essence Islam is not Imperialism. In the abolition of the Caliphate which since the days of Omayyads had practically become a kind of Empire it is only the spirit of Islam that has worked out through the Ataturk. In order to understand the Turkish *Ijtihad* in the matter of the Caliphate we cannot but seek the guidance of Ibn Khaldun—the great philosophical historian of Islam, and the father of modern history. I can do no better than quote here a passage from My *Reconstruction* <sup>1</sup>

“Ibn Khaldun in his famous *Prolegomena* mentions three distinct views of the idea of universal Caliphate in Islam: (i) That universal Imamate is a divine institution and is consequently indispensable (ii) That it is merely a matter of expediency. (iii) That there is no need of such an institution. The last view was taken by the Khwarij, the early republicans of Islam. It seems that modern Turkey has shifted from the first to the second view, *i.e.*, to the view of the Mu'tazila' who regarded universal Imamate as a matter of political thinking we must be guided by our past political experience which points unmistakably to the fact that the idea of universal Imamate has failed in practice. It was a workable idea when the Empire of Islam was intact. Since the break-up of this Empire independent units have arisen. The idea has ceased to be operative and cannot work as a living factor in the organization of modern Islam.”

---

1. *Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam*: Oxford University Press.

Nor is the idea of separation of church and state alien to Islam. The doctrine of the major occultation of the Imam in a sense effected this separation long ago in Shia Iran. The Islamic idea of the division of the religious and political functions of the state must not be confounded with the European idea of the separation of church and state. The former is only a division of functions as is clear from the gradual creation in the Muslim state of the offices of *Shaikh-ul-Islam* and Ministers ; the latter is based on the metaphysical dualism of spirit and matter. Christianity began as an order of monks having nothing to do with the affairs of the world ; Islam was, from the very beginning, a civil society with laws civil in their nature though belived to be revelational in origin. The metaphysical dualism on which the European idea is based has borne bitter fruit among Western nations. Many years ago a book was written in America called *If Christ Came to Chicago*. In reviewing this book an American author says :

“The lesson to be learned from Mr. Stead’s book is that the great evils from which humanity is suffering today are evils that can be handled only by religious sentiments ; that the handling of those evils has been in the great part surrendered to the state ; that the state has itself been delivered over to corrupt political machines ; that such machines are not only unwilling, but unable, to deal with those evils ; and that nothing but a religious awakening of the citizens to their public duties can save countless millions from misery, and the

state itself from degradation."

In the history of Muslim political experience this separation has meant only a separation of functions, not of ideas. It cannot be maintained that in Muslim countries the separation of church and state means the freedom of Muslim legislative activity from the conscience of the people which has for centuries been trained and developed by the spirituality of Islam. Experience alone will show how the idea will work in modern Turkey. We can only hope that it will not be productive of the evils which it has produced in Europe and America.

I have briefly discussed the above innovations more for the sake of the Muslim reader than for Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru. The innovation specifically mentioned by the Pandit is the adoption by the Turks and Iranians of racial and nationalist ideals. He seems to think that the adoption of such ideals means the abandonment of Islam by Turkey and Iran. The student of history knows very well that Islam was born at a time when the old principles of human unification, such as blood relationship and throne-culture, were failing. [It, therefore, finds the principle of human unification not in the blood and bones but in the mind of man.] Indeed, its social message to mankind is: "Deracialize yourself or perish by internecine war." It is no exaggeration to say that Islam looks askance at nature's race-building plans and creates, by means of its peculiar institutions, an outlook which would counteract the race-building forces of nature. In the direction of human domestication it has done in one thousand years

more important work than Christianity and Buddhism ever did in two thousand years or more. It is no less than a miracle that an Indian Muslim finds himself at home in Morocco in spite of the disparity of race and language. Yet it cannot be said that Islam is totally opposed to race. Its history shows that in social reform it relies mainly on its scheme for gradual deracialization and proceeds on the lines of least resistance. "Verily," says the Quran. "We have made you into tribes and sub-tribes so that you may be identified ; but the best among you in the eye of God is he who is the purest in life " Considering the mightiness of the problem of race and the amount of time which the deracialization of mankind must necessarily take, the attitude of Islam towards the problem of race, *i.e.*, stooping to conquer without itself becoming a race-making factor, is the only rational and workable attitude. There is a remarkable passage in Sir Arthur Keith's little book. *The Problem of Race*, which is worth quoting here :

"And now man is awakening to the fact that nature's primary end—race-building—is incompatible with the necessities of the modern economic world and is asking himself: What must I do? Bring race-building as practised hitherto by nature to an end and have eternal peace? Or permit nature to pursue her old course and have, as a necessary consequence—War? Man has to choose the one course or the other. There is no intermediate course possible."

It is, therefore, clear that if the Ataturk is inspired by Pan-Turanism he is going not so much



against the spirit of Islam as against the spirit of the time. And if he is a believer in the absoluteness of races, he is sure to be defeated by the spirit of modern time which is wholly in keeping with the spirit of Islam. Personally, however, I do not think that the Ataturk is inspired by Pan-Turanianism, as I believe that his Pan-Turanianism is only a political retort to Pan-Slavonism, or Pan-Germanism, or Pan-Anglo-Saxonism.

If the meaning of the above paragraph is well understood it is not difficult to see the attitude of Islam towards nationalist ideals. Nationalism in the sense of love of one's country and even readiness to die for its honour is a part of the Muslim's faith; it comes into conflict with Islam only when it begins to play the role of a political concept and claims to be a principle of human solidarity demanding that Islam should recede to the background of a mere private opinion and cease to be a living factor in the national life. In Turkey, Iran, Egypt and other Muslim countries it will never become a problem. In these countries Muslims constitute an overwhelming majority and their minorities, i.e., Jews, Christians and Zoroastrians, according to the law of Islam, are either "People of the Book" or "like the People of the Book" with whom the law of Islam allows free social relations including matrimonial alliances. It becomes a problem for Muslims only in countries where they happen to be in a minority, and nationalism demands their complete self-effacement. In majority countries Islam accommodates nationalism; for there Islam and nationalism are practically identical; in minority coun-

tries it is justified in seeking self-determination as a cultural unit. In either case, it is thoroughly consistent with itself.

The above paragraphs briefly sum up the exact situation in the world of Islam today. If this is properly understood it will become clear that the fundamentals of Islamic solidarity are not in any way shaken by any external or internal forces. The solidarity of Islam, as I have explained before, consists in a uniform belief in the two structural principles of Islam supplemented by the five well-known "practices of the faith." These are the first essentials of Islamic solidarity which has, in this sense, existed ever since the days of the Holy Prophet until it was recently disturbed by the Bahais in the Iran and the Qadianis in India. It is a guarantee for a practically uniform spiritual atmosphere in the world of Islam. It facilitates the political combination of Muslim states, which combination may either assume the form of a world-state (ideal) or of a league of Muslim states, or of a number of independent states whose pacts and alliances are determined by purely economic and political considerations. That is how the conceptual structure of this simple faith is related to the process of time. The profundity of this relation can be understood only in the light of certain verses of the Quran which it is not possible to explain here without drifting away from the point immediately before us. Politically then, the solidarity of Islam is shaken only when Muslim states war on one another; religiously it is shaken only when Muslim rebel against any of the basic beliefs and practices of the Faith. It is in

the interest of this eternal solidarity that Islam cannot tolerate any rebellious group within its fold. Outside the fold such a group is entitled to as much toleration as the followers of any other faith. It appears to me that at the present moment Islam is passing through a period of transition. It is shifting from one form of political solidarity to some other form which the forces of history have yet to determine. Events are so rapidly moving in the modern world that it is almost impossible to make a prediction. As to what will be the attitude towards non-Muslims of a politically united Islam, if such a thing ever comes, is a question which history alone can answer. All that I can say is that, lying midway between Asia and Europe and being a synthesis of Eastern and Western outlooks on life, Islam ought to act as a kind of intermediary between the East and the West. But what if the follies of Europe create an irreconcilable Islam? As things are developing in Europe from day to day they demand a radical transformation of Europe's attitude towards Islam. We can only hope that political vision will not allow itself to be obscured by the dictates of imperial ambition or economic exploitation. In so far as India is concerned I can say with perfect confidence that the Muslims of India will not submit to any kind of political idealism which would seek to annihilate their cultural entity. Sure of this they may be trusted to know how to reconcile the claims of religion and patriotism.

One word about His Highness the Agha Khan. What has led Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru to attack the Agha Khan it is difficult for me to discover. Per-

haps he thinks that the Qadianis and the Ismailis fall under the same category. He is obviously not aware that, however, the theological interpretation of the Ismailis may err, they believe in the basic principles of Islam. It is true that they believe in a perpetual Imamate ; but the Imam according to them is not a recipient of divine revelation. He is only an expounder of the law. It is only the other day (vide the *Star of Allahabad*, March 12, 1934) that His Highness the Agha Khan addressed his followers as follows :

“Bear witness that Allah is One. Muhammad is the Prophet of Allah. Quran is the Book of Allah. Kaaba is the Qibla of all. You are Muslims and should live with Muslims. Greet Muslims with *Assalam-o’Alaikum*.

Give your children Islamic names. Pray with Muslim congregations in mosques. Keep fast regularly. Solemnize your marriages according to Islamic rules of *nikah*. Treat all Muslims as your brothers.”

It is for the Pandit now to decide whether the Agha Khan represents the solidarity of Islam or not.

## V

### McTAGGART'S PHILOSOPHY

I was reading the other day Mr. Dickinson's memoir of the late and lamented Mr. McTaggart, that philosopher-saint whose lectures on Kant and

Hegel I had the privilege to attend as an advanced student of Trinity College, Cambridge about a quarter of a century ago. I should like to note a few points which occurred to me while reading this interesting book whose value is very much enhanced by the personal reminiscences of those who had the good fortune of coming into contact with that great thinker.

"As we have pointed out more than once," says Mr. Dickinson, "the origin of McTaggart's philosophy was not in his intellect but in his emotions". This is true—perhaps more or less true of all thinkers—if we look at McTaggart as a thinker <sup>split</sup> torn asunder from the general current of British thought. In order to understand the true significance of his philosophy we must put him back into that current.

Agnosticism is not a permanent mode of thought. It comes and goes. The British mind tried to escape from it in two ways. One is the total elimination of what is called the ultimate Reality. The "Unknown and Unknowable" of Herbert Spencer simply does not exist. Why then look for it? The universe is nothing but perishable phenomena without any eternal reality behind. The other way is that an Eternal Reality does exist behind the world of perishable phenomena and is approachable by a purely speculative method. The first course was adopted by Hume, the second by Green. In opposition to British Phenomenalism, Green affirmed the existence of an Eternal Consciousness. The temporal process, according to Green, is unthinkable without a non-temporal consciousness; for consciousness of change cannot be identical with the process of change. But the eternal conscious-

ness so regarded is nothing more than a Newtonian Space holding the world of eternally inter-related appearances. This view makes it impossible to develop the living concrete self out of a dead immobile system of abstract relations. Bradley's philosophy is the logical outcome of Green. The criterion of reality is coherence and freedom from contradiction. Applying this test the world of appearance, time, change, movement, multiplicity turns out to be a mere illusion. The ultimate Reality is one and immutable. This is the ancient Hindu doctrine of "mava" and the Greek Parmenides again. But how did this illusion originate? Nobody knows. Bradley, however, admits in spite of the contradiction involved in the notion of self that the human self must, in some sense be real. In what sense is it real? He does not explain. McTaggart reaches the absolute by means of dialectic method but he does not stop at the Absolute. The Absolute according to him further differentiates itself into concrete egos. The Universe is not an illusion; it is a system of real selves which cannot be regarded as mere predicates or adjectives of the Absolute. As he wrote to me in December 1919:

I agree what you, as you know, in regarding quite untenable the view that finite beings are adjectives of the Absolute. Whatever they are it is quite certain to me that they are not that.

In this aspect of his teaching. McTaggart is much more genuinely British than either Bradley or Green or Bosanquet. Indeed he was to Hegel as Leibniz was to Spinoza. Thus the character of McTaggart's philosophy was determined not so much

by his private emotions as by the intellectual difficulties as well as the un-British character of neo-Hegelian thought in England. It was also determined by what he called the needs of his country. I quote from another letter of 1920 which he appears to have written after he had read Nicholson's English translation of my *Secrets of Self*:

I am writing to tell you with how much pleasure I have been reading your poems. Have you not changed your position very much? Surely in the days when we used to talk philosophy together, you were much more of a pantheistic and mystic.

For my own part I adhere to my own belief that selves are the ultimate Reality, but as to their true content and their true good my position is, as it was, that is to be found in Eternity and not in time, and in love rather than action.

Perhaps however the difference is largely a question of emphasis—we each lay most weight on what our own country needs. I dare say you are right when you say that India is too contemplative. But I am sure that England—and all Europe—is not contemplative enough. That is a lesson that we ought to learn from you—and no doubt we have something to teach in return.

The point of interest in McTaggart's philosophy, however, is that in his system, mystical intuition as a source of knowledge is much more marked than in the system of Bradley. The need of such a direct revelation is the natural outcome of the failure of a purely speculative method. An Italian writer des-

cribes McTaggart's philosophy as mystical degeneration of English neo-Hegelianism. Nothing of the kind. Some of the greatest minds of the world have felt the need of a direct contact with the ultimate Reality have indeed in some cases achieved such contact, and Plotinus, Ghazzali, and Bergson are instances in point. In his spiritual evolution Kant himself reaches that stage but unlike Ghazzali and others he was led to conceive the ultimate Reality as a regulative idea only. The result of his critical act *as if* He does exist. Not William James but Kant was the real founder of modern Pragmatism. Will then the Italian writer referred to above describe Kant's philosophy as pragmatic degeneration of German thought.

It must, however, be remembered in the case of McTaggart that the mystic revelation of Reality came to him as a confirmation of his thought. His system is deductive not in the sense in which the philosophy of Bergson and Plotinus is deductive. He started with a firm conviction in the power of human reason and that conviction remained with him to the end of his days. His illumination came, I think, as an accidental confirmation of what he had reached through pure reason. That is why he had such an unshakable faith in his wife: "I am grieved that we must part, but you know I am not afraid of death". Such a triumphant faith is the result of a direct revelation alone. And this revelation has nothing to do with what our psychology calls emotion, it is as Mrs. McTaggart rightly insists "actual perception of the senses". Like a true mystic McTaggart rarely mentioned his experiences to others. The ultimate basis of religion is



an experience which is essentially individual and incommunicable. It is because of its private character that mystics see no use in talking about it except to experts and that too for the purpose of verification only. In the history of Islamic mysticism we find many recorded instances in which some mystics have been reported to have travelled thousands of miles for the verification of a single experience. This is technically known as "tasdiq", i.e., verification by an appeal to another man's experience. Knowledge and direct revelation are not mutually opposed; they are complementary to each other. The philosophical theologian simply tries, for the sake of fortunate persons to socialise through reason what is essentially individual. When the mystic Sultan Abu Said met the philosopher Abu Ali Ibn Sina, he is reported to have said, "I *see* what he knows". McTaggart both knew and saw; but his vision I believe did not precede his system. It did not initially inspire his thought, though it did bring to him the warmth of conviction. This to my mind indicates a far more powerful intellect than that of Plotinus or Bergson. Yet the vision of McTaggart, in view of its static character, is not free from the unhealthy influences of Hegelian inspiration. But perhaps we possess no criterion to decide whether the universe in the ultimate essence is at rest or in motion.

Another point on which I would like to say a few words is McTaggart's view of the self. Hegel's indifference to personal immortality has more or less affected all those who received inspiration from him. With Bosanquet and Bradley the self is not a sub-

stance in the sense of Spinoza. It is a construction of thought, a mere predicate or adjective of the Absolute. And this selfhood according to these thinkers is further transcended in the Absolute. This account of the self disregards even the elementary conditions of selfhood as known to living experience. It is much more than a mere predicate of the Absolute; it is a dynamic centre of experience. By this criticism of the common neo-Hegelian view of the self I do not mean to argue for McTaggart's view. All that I mean is to show how his mind tried to escape from the results of English neo-Hegelianism. To McTaggart the self is a real substance. He reached the Absolute through the method of Hegel. But with him the Absolute has further determinations, *i.e.*, the egos of actual experience which participate in the elementary eternity of the Absolute. This amounts to a total dismissal of the Hegelian Absolute. But the result of this dismissal is not a return to Empiricism. It gives us not a world of inter-related appearances but a living world of inter-related egos. Mr. Dickinson thinks that it cuts out science at one stroke. It does nothing of the kind any more than the spiritual pluralism of Leibniz. But while I agree that the self is more than a mere predicate of the Absolute, I cannot agree with McTaggart in the view that the self is elementally immortal. From the mere fact that the individual ego is a differentiation of the eternal Absolute, it by no means follows that even in its finitude the human self retains the character, which belongs to its source alone. To my mind such a differentiation should give it only a capacity for

immortality and not immortality itself. Personally I regard immortality as an inspiration and not something eternally achieved. Man is a candidate for immortal life, which involves a ceaseless struggle in maintaining the tension of the ego. I venture here to quote one or two passages from my poem called "The New Garden of Mystery" :

اگر کوئی کہ من دہم و گمان است  
 نمودش چون نمود لہن و آن است  
 بگو با من کہ دارائے گمان کیست  
 یکے در خود ذکر آن ہے نشان کیست  
 جہاں پیدا و مصحح دلیلیے  
 نمی آید بفرہ جبر ایلیے  
 خودی پنهان زجہت ہے نیاز است  
 یکے اندیش و دریاب این چہ راز است  
 خودی را حق بدان باطل مہندار  
 خودی را کشت ہے حاصل مہندار  
 خودی چوں پختہ گردد الزوال است  
 فراق عاشقان عین دہ سال است  
 شرور را تغیر پالے می توان داد  
 تبید الزوالے می توان داد  
 ددام حق جوئے کار او نیست  
 کہ او را این ددام از جستجو نیست  
 دوام کن بہ کہ جان مستعارے  
 شود از عشق و مستی پائدارے  
 زان مرگے کہ می آید چہ پاک است  
 خودی چوں پختہ شد از مرگ پاک است

مرگ دہلے لرزد دلِ من  
 دلِ من ' جانِ من ' آب و گلِ من  
 زکارِ عشق و مستی بر فتادن  
 شرر را خود نجات کے ندان  
 دستِ خود کفنِ بردستِ بردن  
 ہچشمِ خویش مرگِ خویش دیدن  
 ترا این مرگِ ہر دمِ در گھٹن است  
 ہنس ازوے کہ مرگِ ما ہمیں است

But while I disagree with McTaggart in his view of immortality, I regard this part of his work as almost apostolic. He emphasised personal immortality even at the expense of the transcendent God of Christian theology, at a time when this important belief was decaying in Europe and when the European man was about to face death on an enormous scale. Indeed in this aspect of his work he may be compared to the great Muslim mystic Hallaj, whose undying phrase "I am the creative truth" was thrown as a challenge to the whole Muslim world at a time when Muslim scholastic thought was moving in a direction which tended to obscure the reality and destiny of the human ego. Hallaj never ceased to utter what he had personally seen to be the truth until the *mullas* of Islam prevailed upon the state to imprison him and finally to crucify him. He met his death with perfect calm.

There is one more point which I would like briefly to consider here—I mean his atheism. I used to meet him almost every day in his rooms in Trinity and very often our talk turned on the question of

God. His powerful logic often silenced me but he never succeeded in convincing me. There is no doubt as Mr. Dickinson points out in his memoir what he had a positive dislike for the transcendent God of Western theology. The Absolute of the neo-Hegelian lacks life and movement. The Eternal Consciousness of Green is hardly distinguishable from Newtonian Space. How could these satisfy him ? In a letter already quoted he wrote to me :

As far as the life of the individual remains the same in the course of amplification and expression I am inclined to think (for a European you can also be a mystic) that the solution rests in loving the same persons. But indeed it still seems to me, as it did when we first knew one another, that the solution of all problems is found in Love."

Indeed his description of love as the essence of Reality indicates that in spite of his thorough going intellectualism, his soul revolted against the inert Absolute of neo-Hegelianism. Yet in a letter from which I have quoted above he seems to oppose love to action. I do not see the opposition. Love is not passivity. It is active and creative. Indeed on the material plane, it is the only force which circumvents death ; for when death carries away one generation love creates another. He tells us that this love of one person for another ; and further it is the cause and the effect of the proximity of two persons. Now it is because of its character as an active cause that in spite of variety in content of the mutual loves of various persons, it is capable of being *experienced* as a

unity embracing the entire universe. But the crucial point is whether this central unity is an all-inclusive self. This was McTaggart's real difficulty. How could one self, however, superior, include other selves. The self is unique and impervious. The mystic poet Rumi felt the same difficulty. "Between the individual egos and their Sustainer", he says, "obtains a contact which can neither be imagined nor intellectually conceived". In his *Idea of God*, Professor Pringle Pattison also regards this relation as inscrutable by human intellect. But is not the individual ego himself a colony of egos :

اسرار ازل خرا ہی بر خود نظر واکن  
مقالی و بیداری پنهانی و پیدائی

Perhaps it is not possible intellectually to conceive this ultimate unity as an all embracing self. It is my belief as I have pointed out before, that McTaggart's Hegelian inspiration marred the vision which was vouchsafed him. A more serious thing happened to poor Nietzsche whose peculiar intellectual environment led him to think that his vision of the ultimate Ego could be realized in the world of space and time. What grown only out of the inner depths of the heart of men he proposed to create by an artificial biological experiment. He was taken as a mad man and was placed in the hands of those who administered drugs and mixtures. As I said of him in my *Javed Nama* :

بود هلا حے بشعر خود غریب  
جان ز ما برد و کشت او را طیب

The real test of a self is whether it responds to the call of another self. Does Reality respond to us ? It does sometimes by reflection, sometimes by reflection rising higher than itself, *i.e.*, the act of worship. The orders of Muslim mystics have invented various rules and practices by which to come into direct contact with the ultimate Reality. The truth however is that neither worship, nor reflection nor any kind of practices entitle a man to this response from the ultimate Love. It depends eventually what religion calls "grace". The philosophy of McTaggart has in fact raised the great problem of the nature of Love. How will it be solved in Europe if at all ? Surely analytic psychology will never be able to solve it. Its secret lies in the pangs of separation, detachment or as McTaggart would say differentiation.

If the ultimate Reality, *i.e.*, Love has any significance for the life of its own ego-differentiation, it must itself be an all-inclusive ego which sustains, responds, loves and is capable of being loved. In McTaggart's view there is no guarantee that the process of birth, death and rebirth will be endless. On the other hand, he himself suggests in his *Some Dogmas of Religion* that "it may be that the process will eventually destroy itself and merge in a perfection which transcends all time and change". In this eventually we come back to the Absolute again and McTaggart's system defeats its own purpose. The possibility of ego-differentiation merging again into a perfection transcending time and change must be counteracted, however, remote it may be. And this can be done only by taking immortality as a hope, an inspiration, a

duty and not as an eternal fact :

مرا دل سوخت بر قذائی او  
 کفم ساکن بزم آرائی او  
 مثال دانه می کون خودی را  
 نگهدارم نگهدارم خودی را

## VI

### SOME STUDY NOTES

I was reading the other day a book called "The Emergence of Life". The author has tried to apply mathematical method to philosophical research. His method is based on Boole's system of logic which he further develops in the light of modern mathematical investigation. After having discussed his views of Time, Space and Life as seen in the light of modern relativity, he refers in his chapter on non-Special Reality to corporeal resurrection.

The noteworthy point in this passage is how modern science and philosophy, becoming more and more exact, is (?) is furnishing rational foundations for certain religious beliefs which the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries' science rejected as absurd and incredible. Further the Muslim reader will see that the argument in support of corporeal <sup>Resurrection to</sup> resurrection advanced in this passage is practically the same as put forward in the Quran over thirteen hundred years ago. The passage is as follows :

Whether indeed such an apparently fantastic



notion, at any rate, to the scientific mind, as to the resurrection of the body, the most wonderful and I should say, almost incredible mystery of theological teaching, one of the most astounding tenets of the Christian faith insisted upon by St. Paul and firmly held even to this day by some of the most earnest and devout scholars of our time, would admit of a scientific explanation, seems to me in the light of this consideration to be not altogether eliminated from the class of possible and rational beliefs. *Absurd as it may seem, to take on extreme case, that the atoms that compose the body of a person who has been shattered to smithereens by an explosion in the trenches, would by any possibility ever recombine, except by what would truly be called a miracle, there is nothing in the light of these reflection, to hinder the monads from adopting the right 'time and tune' that would enable it once more to respond to one and all of the monads that had served as the chamber of its material environment.*

It must be remembered that the Christian belief in resurrection is based on the supposed fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, i.e., it is based on an historical event which is believed to have happened 2,000 years ago. In the Quran resurrection is taken as a universal property of living organisms. The Quranic argument is summed up in the following verses :

And they used to say : What ! When we die and become dust and bones shall we be raised again ? and our forefathers too. Say : Those who

have gone before and after— all will be brought together at the appointed moment 56, 47-8.

We have made death among you and we are not helpless that we should bring the like of you and create you in a form which you know not. *And you know your first creation, why then do you not ponder.* 56, 60-62.

*Do they not see how God created the first time ; then He will create again, surely it is easy for him. Say go about the earth and see how He caused first creation* So will God bring about the other creation. 29, 19-20.

Does man think that we will not bring together his bones ? Yea. We are powerful that we should complete his limbs 75, 8-4.

And they say : What ! When we become bones and dust, shall we be raised in a fresh form ? Say : Be ye stones or iron or anything else which seems harder to you. Then they say. Who will bring us to life again ? *Say : He who made you the first time.* 17, 49-51.

And man says : What ! When I have died, Shall I be raised to life again ? *Does not man consider that we created him before while he was nothing ?*

As may be seen from the italicised lines, the Quran bases its argument in support of resurrection, not on any event in history, but on the personal experience of every individual. This is exactly the argument which the modern scientific research as quoted above has advanced, viz., the same "time and tune" which brought the monads together the first time and

caused his creation may once more summon together after death the same monads and cause the second creation of man. It may, however, be noted here that this return to life after death is nothing in the sense of the cycle of births and rebirths as commonly understood. The Quran supports the scientific view that all life is a *forward movement*. There is no coming back. Mark the following verses on the point :

When death overtakes any one of them, he says, my Lord ! Send me back (to the world) so that may do good in what I have left behind. Never In front of him there is a barrier till the day of resurrection. 23, 99-101.

By the moon when it becomes full ! Of a certainty you will go from stage to stage. 84, 19-20.

Just as the moon goes through various stages, from the crescent to the full moon, even so is man to advance from a lower to a higher form of life.

Another passage which will interest the Muslim readers.....I came across in a book entitled "Emotion as the Basis of Civilization." This passage refers to the sense of unity in Islam as created by the institution of congregational prayer and pilgrimage. It is as follows :

The vast difficulty of creating any sense of unity or solidarity in such a group (*i.e.*, composed of different nations with different traditions and outlooks) is apparent. All historians declare that the amazing success of Islam in dominating the world is the outstanding coherence of sense of unity in the group, but they do not explain how this miracle was worked. *There can be little doubt that the most*

*effective means was prayer.* The five daily prayers, when all the faithful wherever they were, alone in the grim solitudes of the desert or in the vast assemblies in crowded city, knelt and prostrated themselves towards Mecca, uttering the same words of adoration for the one true God and of loyalty to His Prophet, produced an overwhelming effect even on the spectator and the psychological effect of thus fusing the minds of worshippers in a common adoration and expression of loyalty is certainly stupendous. *Muhammad was the first one to see the tremendous power of public prayer as a uniform culture* and there can be little doubt that the power of Islam is due in a large measure to the obedience of the faithful to this inviolable rule of five prayers.

The giving of alms to the poor was also a means of developing the sense of brotherhood. So likewise was the pilgrimage to Mecca.....the pilgrimage proved in the end a great aid in unification for the men of every tribe and race met at Mecca with a common purpose and in a common worship and a feeling of brotherhood would not but be engendered in the process.

---

*PART THREE*

**MISCELLANEOUS STATEMENTS**

So long as this so-called Democracy, this accursed Nationalism and this degraded Imperialism are not shattered, so long as men do not demonstrate by their actions that they believe that the whole world is the family of God, so long as distinctions of race, colour and geographical nationalities are not wiped out completely, they will never be able to lead a happy and contented life and the beautiful ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity will never materialise.

# I

*Letter of resignation of the office of Secretary of the  
All-India Muslim League, published on the 24th  
June 1928.*

As you know I have been suffering from a slight indisposition since the middle of May last and had gone recently to Delhi for treatment.

On my return on June 21, I found the substance of the League's memorandum to the Simon Commission published in the Press.

You are aware that I had expressed my difference of opinion relating to some important points—principally the question of provincial autonomy—in the first meeting of the Draft Committee which was held at the President's residence.

The original draft was merely <sup>experimental</sup> tentative meant for eliciting opinions from other members of the League, a large number of whom expressed their opinions in due course regarding the various points discussed in the original draft.

A final draft was prepared after the receipt of these opinions but by that time I had unfortunately fallen ill and was for this reason unable to attend the discussion of the final draft.

I now find that the extract of the League memorandum as published in the Press makes no demand for full provincial autonomy and suggests a unitary form of provincial government in which law, order and justice

should be placed under the direct charge of the Governor. It is hardly necessary for me to say that this suggestion is only a veiled form of diarchy and means no constitutional advance at all.

Since I still stick to my opinion, which I expressed at the first meeting of the Draft Committee, that the All-India Muslim League should demand full provincial autonomy (which, in my opinion, is the demand of the whole Punjab community), I ought not in the circumstances remain Secretary of the All-India Muslim League. Kindly accept my resignation.

---

## II

*Extract from a letter to Sir Francis Younghusband, published in the "Civil and Military Gazette" on the 30th July 1931.*

I have read with great interest the pages in *Life in the Stars* which have been devoted to the discussion of that illuminating conception of *esprit de corps* which you have taken. This notion of *esprit de corps*, the application of which you have so widely extended, may be considered as constituting the very essence of this book.

You have put a lofty ideal before us which, let us hope, the British people and the rest of the world will strive to realize. England to whom this book is primarily addressed and in whose capacity to serve this ideal you seem to have a profound faith must take the lead in the campaign against the forces of



war and hatred and we in this country shall be proud to co-operate with her in this noble task. I do not say so in any spirit of sarcasm. A great many of us here including myself, believe that England is capable of leading humanity in that direction. The tremendous common sense of her people, her political wisdom based on a sound knowledge of human nature, the clamour and dignity of her people, her moral superiority over others in many essential respects, her wonderful control of the material forces at her command, the many humanitarian movements which are in existence in the country in day and the general discipline which one observes in every department of British life are all facts which no outside observer can fail to recognize. It is the harmonious combination of these qualities of character in the British race which has been the cause of its ascendancy in the world.

I am looking forward to the day when the disputes between England and India will be settled and the two countries will begin to work together not only for their mutual benefit but for the great good of mankind.

There is no need for pessimism on either side. There are people who seem to be overwhelmed by the strength and apparent universality of the bad feelings which exist between the two countries to day. I am not one of them.

In my judgment they are normal and inevitable accompaniment of an age of readjustment and will pass away without irremediable disaster to anybody if we keep our heads and our sense of humour and

have the self-control to resist the appeal to hatred or pride, violence or intolerance to which they are always trying to allure us.

The principle of readjustment are the common-places of history. They have been going on ever since time began. The history of Europe deals with little else. And readjustment is no less inevitable between the East and the West though the transition there has naturally taken longer to work out.

It is no doubt true that we in this country need readjustment between ourselves. We cannot look forward to international peace unless and until our own house is set in order and we learn to live in harmony with one another.

India's internal strife and disunion have been a great disturbing factor in the peace of the world. Grave as the situation may seem at the present moment, I have not lost faith in the possibility of achieving communal agreement in India. While realizing the seriousness and importance of the Hindu-Muslim problem, with which this country is confronted today and the practical difficulties involved in finding a satisfactory solution of it. I cannot allow myself to believe, as many people unfortunately do both here and in England, that all human efforts directed to uniting the two communities are doomed to failure.

I am not ashamed to say that in solving this problem we may need the assistance of Britain guided by the best of motives.

Any attempt on the part of Great Britain at the next Round Table Conference to take an undue advantage of communal split will ultimately prove dis-

astrous to both countries. If you transfer political authority to the Hindu and keep him in power for any material benefit to Great Britain, you will drive the Indian Muslim to use the same weapon against the Swaraj or Anglo-Swaraj Government as Gandhi did against the British Government.

Moreover, it may result in the whole of Muslim Asia being driven into the lap of Russian Communism which would serve as a *coup de grace* to British supremacy in the East.

I do not myself believe that the Russians are by nature an irreligious people. On the contrary, I think that they are men and women of strong religious tendencies and the present negative state of Russian mind will not last indefinitely, for no system of society can rest on an atheistic basis. As soon as things settle down in that country and its people have time to think calmly, they will be forced to find a positive foundation for their system.

Since Bolshevism plus God is almost identical with Islam, I should not be surprised if, in the course of time, either Islam would devour Russia or Russia Islam. The result will depend, I think, to a considerable extent on the position which is given to the Indian Muslims under the new constitution.

Please do not think that I have any prejudice against the Hindus. In fact, I have great admiration for the spirit of self-sacrifice and courage which they have shown in recent years. They have produced men of eminence in every walk of life and are fast advancing along social and economic lines.

I shall have no objection to be ruled by the

Hindu if he has the tact and the ability to govern but, I cannot worship two gods. It must be either him alone or the British alone, but not the two together.

I have stated to you in a nutshell the position taken by the Indian Muslims to day. This does not, however, mean that I am pessimistic about the future of Hindu-Muslim question. Somehow I feel hopeful that some solution of the Indian communal problem will be found at the next Round Table Conference which would satisfy all parties including the British. We must approach this problem in a spirit of optimism, hoping for the best, expecting the ordinary and being prepared for the worst.

I imagine that some people would say : "It is all very well to indulge in such pious hopes but look at the continual quarrelling and disturbance, at non-co-operation and civil disobedience, at the repression of the British authorities, at the terrorism by the extremists in Bengal and at the Cawnpore riots." Well, what do you expect ? Democracy means rows. If anybody thinks that approach to democracy means sailing into a kind of lotus land, he cannot have read a word of history. The truth is exactly the opposite,

Democracy lets loose all sorts of aspirations and grievances which were suppressed or unrealized under autoeracy ; it arouses hopes and ambitions often quite unpractical and it relies not on authority but on argument or controversy from the platform, in the Press, in Parliament, gradually to educate people to the acceptance of a solution which may not be ideal but which is the only practical one in the circumstances of the time.

Therefore, when I look over the tempestuous history of the last ten years in India, I feel inclined not to groan or despair but to congratulate both India and England on making a very good start.

We certainly have had the growing pains of democracy, but I do not think that there is a person in England or here who will not agree that as a result everybody in India and in Britain alike understands what the real problems of Indian self-government are far better than they did ten years ago. And they have had all this painful but salutary education without destroying the structure of government itself.

Democratic government has attendant difficulties but these are difficulties which human experience elsewhere shows to be surmountable. It is, and has always been, a question of faith. Our faith too depends on affection and understanding;

What we need for a swift solution of the political problem of India is faith. I believe it to be growing rapidly among you in the West. I believe our rulers and their officials to be now realizing its significance in a fashion in which they did not realize it ten years ago.

To the recognition of a common ideal and to the avoidance of friction in advancing along the path of self-rule let us here and in the West address ourselves.

---

## III

*Statement on his impressions of World Muslim Congress,  
published on the 1st January 1932.*

I approached some of the holy places common to Islam, Christianity and Judaism with a rather sceptic mind as to the authenticity of the traditions centred round them. But inspite of this feeling I was very much affected by them, particularly by the birth-place of Christ.

I discovered, however, that the altar of the church at Bethlehem was divided into three parts which were allotted to the Armenian, Greek and Catholic churches respectively. These sects continuously fight among themselves, sometimes indulging in bloodshed and defiling one another's altars and—contrary to the state of affairs in India—it is two Muslim policemen who have to keep the peace among them.

I was a member of the various sub-committees formed to discuss distinct proposals, but unfortunately was not able to take part in all of them. In one sub-committee I strongly opposed the idea of establishing at Jerusalem a University on the old and antiquated lines of the Jamia Azhar in Cario and insisted on the proposed University being of a thoroughly modern type.

I do not know now the misunderstanding arose which caused the rumour that I was opposed to the establishment of any kind of University at Jerusalem. Reuter sent out a wire to that effect. Actually I am a strong advocate of Arabic-speaking countries setting

up not one four several Universities for the purpose of transferring modern knowledge to Arabic which is the only non-European language that has kept pace with the progress of thought in modern times.

---

#### IV

*Statement on the Report of the Indian Franchises,  
Committee published on the 5th June 1932.*

I personally do not believe that undiluted Western democracy can be a success here and therefore very much appreciate the various methods by which the Committee has tried to secure an opportunity of self-expression to the different classes and numerous interests which constitute India. One of the methods which the economically backward classes ought to welcome is the Committee's departure from the rule of uniform franchise.

Another noteworthy feature of the Report is the Committee's recommendation for immediate preparation of an electoral roll in order to judge before the actual introduction of reforms how far the population of various communities is reflected among voters.

---

#### V

*Statement explaining the postponement of the meeting  
of the Executive Board of the All-India Muslim  
Conference, issued on the 29th June 1932.*

Several members of the Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference considering it advisable

to postpone the meeting of the Board to be held at Allahabad on July 3, the meeting is postponed till the end of July. A meeting of the Working Committee is, however, likely to meet as early as possible in order to consider the situation.

The Muslims of India expect that a definite announcement will be made by the end of July. I hope that all the material necessary for the decision of the communal problem being before the British Government, they will not delay the decision any further.

It is my considered opinion that in the present circumstances and in view of our work during the last two years the postponement of the Allahabad meeting is highly advisable.

In postponing the meeting I am fully sensible of my responsibility as President of the Conference. While I am aware of the impatience of the Muslims of India for the expected decision, I am firmly of the opinion that the real question now before the community relates to the nature of the announcement and not to the date of it. The character of our future programme must be determined by the nature of the announcement and not by the fact of its being delayed.

---

## VI

*Statement further; explaining the postponement of the meeting of the Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference, issued on the 6th July 1932.*

I have read the proceedings of the public meeting held by certain prominent members of the All-India



Muslim Conference at Allahabad on July 4. I welcome the formation of an Independent Party within the Conference. In my address to the Lahore session of the Muslim Conference I said as follows :

The guidance offered to the community is not always independently conceived, and the result is ruptures, sometimes at critical moments, within our political organisations. Thus these organizations cannot properly develop the kind of discipline which is absolutely essential to the life and power of political bodies. To remedy this evil I suggest that the Indian Muslims should have only one political organization with provincial and district branches all over the country. Call it whatever you like ; what is essential is that its constitution must be such as to make it possible for any school of political thought to come into power and to guide the community according to its own ideas and methods. In my opinion this is the only way to make ruptures impossible, and to reintergrate and discipline our scattered forces to the best interests of Islam in India.

I have, therefore, no doubt that in forming a party within the Conference, Maulana Hazrat Mohani and others have taken a step in the right direction.

I think, however, that the Muslims of India are entitled to know my view of the situation created by the resignation of Maulana Shafi Daudi and the resolution passed by the public meeting at Allahabad protesting against what they call my action in postponing the meeting of the Executive Board which was to have been held on July 3.

I honestly believe that Maulana Shafi Daudi is not at all justified in his action. I requested him immediately after the publication of his resignation in the Press to withdraw it and to settle matters amicably with Syed Zakir Ali and others.

As to the postponement of the meeting of the Executive Board, what I did was simply to advise postponement on certain grounds. This advice I am convinced was perfectly sound not only because of the innumerable telegrams received by Maulana Shafi Daudi, Dr. Shafaat Ahmad Khan and myself but also because of the fact that a meeting of the Working Committee held at Simla, where I was unfortunately unable to be present, had authorised Maulana Shafi Daudi to postpone the meeting in case, in his opinion, there was no likelihood of the communal decision being announced by July 3.

This authorisation was unanimously accepted by all members of the Working Committee who were present. Maulana Shafi Daudi too willingly accepted the responsibility. Why he has not mentioned this fact in his resignation or subsequent statements it is not possible for me to say.

In the circumstances it is unfair to me to say that I acted as a dictator. According to my judgment, postponement was desired by a majority of members of the Conference. My personal opinion was the same. After giving the matter most anxious consideration I arrived at the conclusion that while it was the duty of the community to fight the Government in case the communal decision was not favourable to Muslims, I ought not to advise them to start

any kind of direct action merely because the Government was guilty of not announcing the communal decision within a certain time-limit. This frank statement of facts will, hope, enable the Muslims to see whether my advice for postponement of the meeting of the Executive Board was inspired by Simla dictates. In my private and public life I have never followed another man's conscience. I regard the man who is capable of following another's conscience when the most important interests of the community are at stake as unworthy of Islam and humanity.

Let me make it perfectly clear that the cautious behaviour of those who desired postponement should not be so interpreted as to mean that they are less anxious than others to act on the Lahore resolution if necessity for action arises.

Until such necessity arises the community should hold its forces in reserve. Wisdom lies not in wasting one's energy on unessentials but in saving it for expenditure on issues which really matter.



## VII

*Statement on the reported split in the All-India Muslim Conference, issued on the 25th July 1932.*

There is no real split as far as the present Muslim attitude towards the announcement of the communal decision is concerned. The leaders of the new party were in Lahore a few days ago and had long talks with me about the past work of the Conference and future

possibilities. They finally agreed to my view that since the British Government had undertaken to decide the communal problem—practically at the request of the Indian communities—we must wait till that decision and hold the postponed meeting of the Executive Board of the Conference at a suitable place shortly after its announcement.

I am glad that the good sense of our community has saved us from mutual dissension on this issue. I am sure that on account of the experience acquired by it during the last ten years, the community as a whole fully understands the many sides of the present political problem in the country; and I have every hope that its strong commonsense will not fail it when it is again called upon to appraise the value of political alternative which the future may disclose.

---

## VIII

*Statement on the Sikh demands, issued on the 25th July 1932.*

I have read the Sikh leaders' memorials, manifestoes and resolutions with much interest. But I do not think it necessary to enter on verbal wrangling with these gentlemen, some of whom are my personal friends.

The kind of demonstration embodied in these memorials, manifestoes and meetings was only to be expected on the eve of the decision of the communal problem. Moreover, as Sardar Ujjal Singh has pointed out, the Sikhs are concerned more with the communal

problem than with the constitutional progress of the country. Such an attitude, even if inspired by love of one's own community, cannot appeal to those who, while anxious to protect the legitimate interests of a particular class, find it impossible to ignore the interests of India as a whole.

Nor is it necessary for any Muslim to take serious notice of my Sikh friends' attempt to discover something like historical justification for their opposition to the Muslim demands, though I greatly regret the language in which they have chosen to express this opposition and which unfortunately tends to excite religious fanaticism among the Sikh masses. It is further unfortunate that the consequences of the purely negative attitude of the Sikhs in opposing the Muslim right to majority representation in the Punjab are not fully realized. The Sikh attitude in the Punjab, encouraged, as it is, by Hindus is, I am very much afraid, producing its natural reaction in making Muslims and other minorities seriously apprehensive of domination by a communal majority which will be in power at the centre and in six provinces. The growing apprehension on the part of the minorities is bound to have a most pernicious effect on the future history of India.

Our own position is, however, perfectly clear. The Muslims of India are as anxious to protect their communal interests as to secure the constitutional advance of the country. The safeguards which they demand are essential for their protection as an all-India minority. They accept the principle of majority rule in the Centre and in those provinces where they happen to be in a hopeless minority provided

they are not deprived of the countervailing and legitimate advantage of being in a majority in certain other provinces. They have explained their position time and again to the sister communities and the British Government and, with the sole exception of the Sikhs, all Indian minorities have agreed to their demands.

---

## IX

*Statement on Sir Jogendra Singh's proposal for Sikh-Muslim negotiations, published on the 4th August 1932.*

I received, on July 29, from Sardar Sir Jogendra Singh what he described as a short note which, according to him, might form the basis of a discussion and I was asked what I thought of it. I cannot say whether he wrote similar letters to other Muslims. The letter which he sent to me was marked private. It seems, however, that its contents have already been disclosed to the Press.

I would have heartily endorsed a communal pact for the Punjab on a reasonable basis. But the way in which publicity has been given to Sir Jogendra's note makes me suspect the whole affair.

My reasons, however, for rejecting Sir Jogendra's proposals were, as mentioned in my reply, that while they were apparently intended to concede to Muslims a majority of one in the total House, they would actually reduce Muslims to an equality with non-Muslims and most probably to minority.

I further pointed out that Muslims could in no case accept less than 51 per cent seats and that a concession of 51 per cent seats to them could not amount to what was being called a Muslim *raj*.

Seeing that Sir Jogendra meant to arrive at a settlement before the British Government's announcement, I also wrote to him that the subject of his note could be discussed even after the announcement.

In reply to my letter I received from him, on August 3, another letter in which he suggested a totally different scheme which, in my opinion, was as unacceptable to Muslims as the first one. Since, according to an Associated Press message, these negotiations have been communicated to the British Government, my fear is that this may result in delaying the promised announcement by the British Government.

I, therefore, consider it absolutely necessary to emphasise the fact that since no communal settlement prior or subsequent to the announcement can be acceptable to Muslims unless it provides for 51 per cent seats for Muslims in the provincial legislature as agreed to in the Minorities' Pact, it will only aggravate the situation if the announcement is allowed to be delayed by such negotiations.

It is obvious that Sir Jogendra's proposals recognise the principle of separate electorates to the extent of 150 seats in a total number of 175. His Calculations mentioned in his note further give a majority of at least one to Muslims in the total House. In the circumstances I see no reason why our Sikh brethren should not further try to remove Muslim fears of

being reduced to a minority or an equality by agreeing to the minimum demands of Muslims which other Indian minorities have already agreed to.

---

## X

*Statement explaining the resolution passed by the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim Conference regarding Sikh-Muslim conversations, issued on the 10th August 1932.*

I consider it my duty to make it perfectly clear why the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim Conference at its last meeting in Delhi passed the resolution relating to the Sikh-Muslim conversations in Simla.

First, while fully recognising the value of communal concord, the members of the Committee thought that such conversations at the present moment might delay the Government announcement and still further aggravate the Sikh-Muslim situation in the Punjab.

Secondly, in view of certain statements issued to the Press by some of the Sikh leaders, they felt that nothing was likely to come out of these conversations. This feeling is amply justified by the latest statement of Sir Jogendra published today. In his letter to me, Sir Jogendra clearly mentioned the figures 28 and 87 for Muslims and non-Muslims respectively.

These figures were no doubt based on his calculation relating to special constituencies, but I hope he



will excuse me for a bit of cruel psychology when I say that mention of specific figures was perhaps meant only to decoy me in the belief that he agreed at least to majority of one for Muslims in the total House. Sir Jogendra accuses me of drawing unfortunate inferences from his proposals. I assure him that in the presence of the specific figures mentioned in his letter no inference was necessary.

On the other hand, in spite of these figures, I could not but understand him to mean what he has now plainly stated without the mention of any specific figures, namely, that he offered only a possibility to Muslims for securing more seats out of those allotted to special constituencies.

I agree that he offered only a possibility, but if, this is the Sikh view of the situation then the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim Conference was right in thinking that there was no likelihood of any material settlement.

Again Sir Jogendra says that whatever the offer was, it was not made on behalf of the Sikh community. I do not pretend to know anything about the origin of his proposal. Nor was it necessary to hazard a guess. After giving some important details of his proposal Sir Jogendra himself says in his letter; "...Muslims to give support to Sikhs to secure for them 5 per cent seats in the Central Legislature, 6 per cent in the Frontier Province and a seat in the Central Cabinet. The Sikhs will join the Minorities' Pact."

However, it is unnecessary now to enter into a controversy of the kind. My object in this statement is to make the position of the Working Committees

clear as possible and I hope I have done so.

As far as Sikh-Muslim conversations at Simla are concerned, I must make it plain that although I would welcome any reasonable material settlement, which need not necessarily be prior to the announcement to be made on August 17, I cannot, as President of the Muslim Conference, participate in these conversations unless properly authorised by the Working Committee of that body.

---

## XI

### *Statement on the Communal Award, issued on the 24th August 1932.*

The decision of His Majesty's Government has invoked divergent criticisms characteristic of this land of minorities. This in itself ought to be instructive to those fact-shy politicians who take an easy view of the complexity of the Indian constitutional problem and think that India possesses, or is capable of possessing, on the whole a single national point of view. And all this unhappy fire-work of phrases comes from people who openly confessed their inability to solve their own problems in requesting a third party to give them decision which, be it remembered, does not close the door for an agreed settlement.

Amidst this welter of indiscriminate criticism, however, a disinterested student of Indian politics will find great relief in reading the views of Sir Tej Bahadur Sapru—the acute politician who combines a

clear vision of present actualities with a penetrating glance into the future and shows infinite patience in working out the minute details of a complex situation.

I may also recall the amusing observation made in this connection by a gentleman of Bombay who said that the British Government's decision might as well have been written by myself. I assure him that if I had been called upon to give a decision on the Indian communal problem, I should not have done such glaring injustice to Muslims as the present decision does.

I honestly believe that no community has a more genuine grievance against the decision than Muslims. Indeed, I cannot explain to myself how the British conscience has tolerated this injustice.

The outcry that the decision has given a majority representation to Punjab Muslims has absolutely no justification. A Muslim majority, whatever its character, in this province ought not to form a ground of grievance for any community. Besides, in the present case this majority has been made dependent on Muslims winning a number of seats through joint electorates.

The view of the Indian Muslims on the British Government's decision are embodied in the resolution adopted by the Executive Board of the All-India Muslim Conference at Delhi the other day. I need not repeat them. But it appears from a careful study of the decision that it attempts to vindicate two political principles i.e., no majority should be reduced to a minority and the interests of the minorities should

be protected by giving them suitable weightage. In the application of both these principles it is the Muslims who suffer.

The position of Muslims in Bengal proves the violation of the first principle to the detriment of the Muslims and the figures relating to the weightage given to minorities in various provinces prove that the second principle has been applied more generously to Hindus in the Frontier Province than to Muslims in any other province. In the Punjab the Sikh minority has been given weightage to an extent which reduces the probable Muslim majority to the narrowest possible margin.

The Muslims of Bengal who have been given 48.4 instead of 61 per cent needed only another 2 per cent to ensure an odd majority for them. But His Majesty's Government have thought fit to observe the terms of the Minorities' Pact as far as it related to Europeans and to ignore it as far as it related to Bengal Muslims. Is it because blood is thicker than water or because this injustice to Muslims serves the double object of helping the Europeans and pleasing the Hindus ?

The important question for Muslims, however, is what is to be done ? I believe that a perfectly constitutional method is open to Muslims to adopt in this connection. Bengal is one of those provinces which have demanded two Houses of Legislature. The constitution of an Upper House for it is yet to be framed and what the relations between the two Houses will be and whether the Government will be responsible to the Lower House only or to both Houses put together, are questions which are yet to be settled. If

representation on a population basis is secured for Muslims in the Upper House and if Government is made responsible to both Houses put together, Muslims may still have a majority in that province. In view of the fact that special interests have received full attention in the Lower House the above method will only do bare justice to Bengal Muslims.

I must add that the mere allotment of seats to various communities is in itself of no great consequence. What is vital is the amount of power which may be transferred to the provinces of India. If real power comes to the provinces there is no doubt that the minorities of India, Muslims and non-Muslims, will have an opportunity of improving their political position in the country and that in working out the coming constitution, Muslims in their majority provinces will, in view of their past history and traditions, prove themselves free from all pettiness of mind and narrowness of outlook. Their one duty, to my mind, is a war against illiteracy and economic slavery.

— — —

## XII

*Statement on the Lucknow Conference of nationalist Muslim leaders, issued on the 8th October 1932.*

I returned from Simla to Lahore on Friday and found a telegram from Shaikh Abdul Majid Sindhi, President of the Khilafat Conference, awaiting me. Mr. Sindhi asked my opinion about holding a conference of Muslim leaders with a view to some sort of a

settlement with the majority community. I wired to him that in the absence of any definite proposals from the majority community such a conference would be inadvisable and futile.

The same evening I received another telegram from Mr. Sindhi informing me that my reply had reached him too late and that an informal conference of Muslim leaders had been decided upon. He asked me to participate in the deliberations of this conference. In reply I requested him to reconsider his decision and since I believed such a conference to be inexpedient as well as logically unwarranted, I informed him of my inability to participate in its deliberations.

Since then I have received telegrams from various places asking me to hold a special session of the All-India Muslim Conference to reiterate the position of the Conference and counter the Bombay<sup>1</sup> move. In these circumstances I consider it my duty to voice the community's strong opposition to the proposed Lucknow Conference. In the absence of definite proposals from Hindu leaders I fail to see what we are asked to discuss in this Conference.

The Muslims of India have always shown readiness for a mutual settlement with other communities, but the way which is now being adopted is not the way to a settlement with Hindus but to disunity in our own ranks which we have consolidated with great difficulty.

1 This conference was sequel to talks in Bombay between Pandit Madan Mohan Malviya, Maulana Shaukat Ali, Shaikh Abdul Majid Sindhi and Maulana Abul Kalam Azad.

To treat the question of electorates lightly and reopen it inspite of the community's clear verdict, as embodied in the resolutions of the Muslim Conference and the Muslim League, is a most inadvisable course which may have far-reaching consequences for the community. In the wider interests of the community and country this question should be considered as closed for the time being. There are before us other questions of far greater importance than that of joint *versus* separate electorates. Nor are separate electorates really contrary to nationalist ideas.

I consider the proposed Conference harmful to the interests of Islam and India and an absolute waste of time. I hope that the sponsors of the Conference will reconsider their position. The Muslim community should now be called upon to look forward to the solution of important constitutional problems lying ahead instead of being dragged back to the problems which have already cost us many bitter controversies but which we have now left behind.

---

### XIII

*Statement on the resolution passed on the Lucknow  
Conference of the Nationalist Muslim leaders  
issued on the 17th October 1932.*

After reading the resolution of the Lucknow Conference I feel that it is not without its saving grace. The resolution practically repeats the position which I took up in regard to communal negotiations—that definite proposals should first come from the side

of the majority community.

The resolution makes any consideration of the question of electorates by Muslims dependent on a definite acceptance of the other thirteen demands of the All-India Muslim Conference. It is now for the Hindus to say whether they are prepared to open negotiations.

I think that on the whole the resolution brings our Nationalist Muslim brethren much nearer to the general body of Muslims than they have been so far. They have now agreed to abide by the verdict of the Muslim community on the question of electorates. I am convinced that the resolutions of the All-India Muslim Conference and the All-India Muslim League already constitute such a verdict. But if another verdict is needed they are welcome to have it.

---

## XIV

*Statement on the constitution emerging from the Round Table Conference, issued on the 26th February 1933.*

As far as the Indian Muslims are concerned, it is their duty to organise themselves for the coming elections and scrupulously avoid all causes of action which may lead to sectional differences among themselves. The proposed constitution clearly recognises the principle of protection of minorities. This is the only way of giving the minorities a national outlook. It is now for the minorities themselves, who were parties to the Minorities' Pact made in London, to take full advantage of the opportunities given to



them.

Whatever else one may say about the results of the Round Table Conferences, nobody can deny that they have given birth to a people who are at once new and ancient. I believe it to be one of the most remarkable facts of modern history. Not even a far-sighted historian can realize the full consequences of the birth of this new-ancient people. I only hope that their leaders will remain alert and not allow the growth of self-consciousness among their people to be arrested by external forces, social or political.

---

## XV

*Statement on the conditions prevailing in Europe, issued on the 26th February 1933.*

After visiting different European countries and seeing the general moral chaos of the modern world, I am convinced that the great opportunity for Islam as a faith has come. Millions upon millions of men and women in Europe are anxious to know what Islam and its cultural ideals are. The sooner the younger generation of Muslims realizes this fact the better. European Muslims have already realized it. They are holding a conference in Geneva in August next, the object of the proposed conference being purely social and cultural. I hope the Muslims of Asia and Africa will generously respond to the promoters of the conferences.

I visited Cordova, Granada, Seville, Toledo and Madrid and besides seeing the historic mosque at

Cordova, and the Alhambra in Granada, I visited the ruins of *Medinatuz Zehra*, the famous palace built on a mountain by Abdur Rehman I for his wife Zehra, where excavations are still going on. It was there that the first demonstration of a flying machine was given in the twelfth century by a Muslim inventor. I had the privilege of meeting, among others, the Education Minister of the Spanish Government, an exceedingly courteous gentleman with a breadth of vision hardly to be expected in a country like Spain, and Professor Asin, the well-known author of *Divine Comedy and Islam*. Under the directions of the Education Minister the department of Arabic in the University of Granada is being greatly expanded. The head of this department is a disciple of Professor Asin.

The Spaniards living in the south of the country are proud of their Moorish origin and of the great monuments of Islamic culture which are to be found there. A new consciousness is steadily growing in the country and will further expand with the development of education. The movement of reform started by Luther has not yet exhausted itself. It is still working quietly in different European countries and the hold of priesthood, especially in Spain, is gradually loosening.

---

## XVI

*Statement on the constitution outlined in the White Paper, issued on 29th March 1933.*

It is of course impossible for a document of this kind fully to satisfy all sections of people, especially in

a country like India. Whether a community would be willing to give a trial to the proposed scheme in spite of its unsatisfactory character depends on a multiplicity of actualities which would have to be carefully examined.

Muslims would be greatly disappointed by the proposed composition of Federal Legislature. In the Lower House the Muslims have been guaranteed only 82 seats out of a proposed total of 375. The Muslims share works out at 21·8 per cent of the total House. Indian states which on a population basis are entitled only to 25 per cent seats in the Federal Legislature have been given 33·3 per cent which means a weightage of 8 per cent. Such a weightage should in fairness have gone to Muslims as an important minority community and not to the states which are in no sense a minority and whose interests are in no danger of encroachment. The present scheme amounts to packing the Central Legislature with practically nominated members at the expense of Muslim minority which had demanded Federation for the protection of its own as well as the other minorities' interest.

The allocation of 9 seats to women as a 'special interest' is another undesirable feature of the Federal Legislature. The electorate for these seats will be predominantly non-Muslim and it will be impossible for Muslim women to be elected. Muslim women ought to have been considered part of their community. In this respect Sir Mohammad Yakub's note of dissent to the Franchise Committee's Report has been completely ignored.

In the Upper House the system of a single

transferable vote to be exercised by members of provincial Legislatures introduces the principle of joint electorates and would fail to secure a due proportion of seats for Muslims.

Under the new scheme ministers in the provinces will be as little responsible to the legislature and as much responsible to Governor as they are now. The special responsibilities of Governors cover a very wide field.

The scheme proposed for Baluchistan will never satisfy the Baluchis or the Muslim community in general. Nor do I find in the scheme any adequate safeguard for the personal law of Muslims.

The White Paper demands serious consideration by the Muslim community. I hope the Working Committee of the All-India Muslim Conference will fully consider it and give the community a clear lead.

---

## XVII

*Statement on the rebellion in Chinese Turkestan, published on the 16th May 1933.*

Turkestan is a vast country divided into three parts, one of which is ruled by Russia, the other by Afghanistan and the third by China. In 1914 there was a great deal of discontent in Chinese Turkestan owing to the appointment of Chinese magistrates in that country and an attempt made by the Chinese Government to impose the Chinese language on the

population which is almost wholly Muslim. But matters did not come to a head then. As far as I know the present revolution in that country began in 1930 under the leadership of a 17-year-old Muslim boy named Chong Yng.

Mr. Petro of the Citroen Haardt expedition who met this "infant" Muslim general in Turkestan related his experiences during a lecture to the Central Asian Society in England in 1932. During that year, Ma Chong Yng was besieging the city of Hami and the services of Mr. Petro were availed of for purposes of peace negotiations with the besieged Chinese forces. Mr. Petro who was received by the Chinese general and the Chinese Defence Consul in the city, was expecting to be questioned regarding the strength and plans of the army of besiegers. Much to his surprise, however, the first and only question put to him by the Chinese general was: 'Is it true that Ma Chong Yng is only 20 years old?' On being told that Ma was less than that age the Chinese general turned to the Defence Consul who was in favour of surrendering the city and said, 'I am 81 years old and my hair has been white for a long time. My great-grandson is older than this suckling. How do you think I can surrender this city to an infant?'

The old general acted up to his words and resolutely faced hunger and other privations until he received help from the Chinese Government. During a hard struggle Ma was badly wounded and fled to Kan-Su and hostilities came to an end only to be resumed shortly afterwards. Whether Ma is leading the rebellion at its present stage I cannot say ; but

his career which, according to Mr. Petro, may well form the subject of a modern *Odyssey* shows that the home of Chingiz, Taimur and Babar has not ceased to produce military geniuses of the highest order.

I do not think that the cause of this rebellion is religious fanaticism, though in a movement like this all sorts of human sentiments are liable to be exploited by leaders. The causes, I believe, are mainly economic. The 'world' is also thinking today in terms of race an attitude of mind which I consider the greatest blot on modern civilization. I apprehend that the birth of a race-problem in Asia will lead to most disastrous results. The main endeavour of Islam as a religion has been to solve this very problem and if modern Asia wishes to avoid the fate of Europe there is no other remedy but to assimilate the ideals of Islam and to think not in terms of race but in terms of mankind.

My apprehension that the revolution in Chinese Turkestan may develop into a Pan-Turanian movement is borne out by the trend of thought in Central Asia. Only the other day the well-edited monthly of Afghanistan, *Kabul*, published an article from the pen of Dr. Afshaar of Iran calling upon Afghanistan, which was described by the writer as forming part of 'the Greater Iran', to join hands with Iran in order to meet the growing menace of Turanism. In any case the revolution, if it succeeds, is bound to produce repercussion in Afghan and Russian Turkestan, particularly in the latter which is already seething with discontent owing to religious persecution and owing to serious food problem created in that country

by the Russian Government's policy of turning it into a huge cotton farm. In so far as Afghan Turkestan is concerned, the people of Asia may rely, I hope, on the far-sighted idealism of King Nadir Shah.

The success of the revolution will also mean the birth of a prosperous and strong Muslim state in 99 per cent of the population, will be freed from the age-old Chinese oppression. Chinese Turkestan is an extremely fertile country, but owing to Chinese oppression and misrule only five per cent of its land is at present under cultivation. The establishment of another Muslim state between India and Russia will push the menace of the atheistic materialism of bolshevism farther away from the borders of our country, even if it does not drive this menace away from Central Asia as a whole.

The Government of Lord Willingdon, who has the gift of rare political vision, has taken up a wise attitude towards happenings in Chinese Turkestan. This attitude explains and justifies the Government of India's policy regarding the frontiers of Kashmir State.

---

## XVIII

*Statement on the disturbances in Kashmir State, issued on the 7th June 1933.*

The latest *communiqué* issued by the Kashmir Government states that things are quiet in Srinagar. The information that has reached me from reliable

sources is, however, that the situation is not so easy as the official *communiqué* tries to make out. I fear that in the Kashmir Government itself there are forces which have worked in the direction of defeating Col. Colvin's policy.

A *communiqué* recently issued by the Kashmir Government informed the world that the leaders of Muslim parties <sup>2</sup> were arrested according to a unanimous decision of the Cabinet. This is another statement which is not borne out by private information which comes from reliable sources. It seems to me that Col. Colvin's judgment of the situation was perfectly correct—a fact which is proved by the results of the so called unanimous action on the part of the Kashmir Government.

I hold no brief for any of the political parties in Kashmir. But the arrests of the leaders of the two parties and subsequent flogging of people and firing and *lathi* charges on women and children are likely to plunge Kashmir into the same conditions from which it was rescued by Col. Colvin's policy.

I hope the Kashmir Government will try to discover the psychological back ground of the present events and adopt an attitude which may bring peace and goodwill.

Recently several Muslims from Jammu and Kashmir have brought to me <sup>3</sup> and other Muslims in Lahore

<sup>1</sup> Prime Minister, Kashmir State.

<sup>2</sup> Mir Waiz Yusuf's party and S. M. Abdullah's party.

<sup>3</sup> Dr. Iqbal was the President of the All-India Kashmir Committee.



various reports about Kashmir affairs. It was, however, easy, to see that their object was to poison the minds of British Indian Muslims against the Muslims in Kashmir. I cannot say why these people have undertaken this curious mission. I, however, consider it my duty to warn, whosoever may be at the back of this move, that members of the Kashmir Committee are not fools and will not fall into the traps which are perhaps being laid for them.

In conclusion, I appeal to Muslims of Kashmir to beware of the forces that are working against them and to unite their ranks. The time for two or three Muslim political parties in Kashmir has not yet come. The supreme need of the moment is a single party representing all muslims in the state. If perfect unanimity of political opinion is not secured in Kashmir, all efforts of leaders to advance the interests of the people that state will prove ineffective.

---

## XIX

*Statement on his resignation of the office of president of the All-India Kashmir Committee, issued on the 20th June 1930.*

My presidentship of the All-India Kashmir Committee was a temporary arrangement. It will be recalled that the Committee was formed in order to meet a situation which had suddenly arisen in Kashmir. It was considered that the need for such a Committee would disappear before long and no constitu-

tion of the Committee was, therefore, framed; its President having been given practically dictatorial authority.

The belief that the Kashmir Committee would not be needed as a permanent institution was, however, falsified by subsequent development in the Kashmir situation. Most members, therefore, thought that the Committee should have a regular constitution and elect new office-bearers. This idea was reinforced by a certain amount of dissatisfaction which was felt against the composition and working of the Committee on grounds which it would be unpleasant to mention. A meeting of the Committee was therefore called in which the former President submitted his resignation, which was accepted.

In a subsequent meeting of the Committee held during the last week-end, a draft constitution was placed before the members. It aimed at giving the Committee a thoroughly representative character but was opposed by certain members. Further discussion revealed a spirit which gave me to understand that the idea of these gentlemen was to split the Committee into two bodies which would only retain a semblance of outward unity. This is what I plainly told the members before I submitted my resignation.

Unfortunately there are members in the Committee who recognise no loyalty except to the head of their particular religious sect. This was made clear by a public statement recently made by one of the Ahmadi pleaders who had been conducting the Mirpur cases. He plainly admitted that he recognised no

Kashmir Committee and that whatever he or his colleagues did was done in obedience to the command of their religious leader. I confess that I interpreted this statement as a general indication of the Ahmadi attitude of mind and felt doubts about the future working of the Kashmir Committee.

I do not mean to stigmatise anybody. A man is free to develop an attitude which intellectually and spiritually suits his mind best. Indeed I have every sympathy for a man who needs a spiritual prop and finds one in the shrine of a bygone saint or in a living *pir*.

As far as I am aware there are no difference of opinion among members of the Kashmir Committee regarding the Committee's general policy. To the formation of a party on the grounds of differences in policy nobody can object. But according to my view of the situation, the differences in the Kashmir Committee are based on considerations which, I believe, are utterly irrelevant. I do not believe that a smooth working is possible and feel that in the best interests of all concerned the present Kashmir Committee should cease to exist.

At the same time I believe that Kashmir Muslims need the help and guidance of a Kashmir Committee in British India. If British Indian Muslims are anxious to help and guide their Kashmir brethren they are free to reconstitute a Kashmir Committee in a mass meeting. In view of the present situation this is the only course that I can suggest.

I have made an absolutely frank statement of the feelings which led me to resign my office. I hope

this plain speaking will hurt nobody as there is no spirit of ill-will or mental reservation behind it.

---

## XX

*Statement on his rejection of the offer of presidentship of the "Tehrik-i-Kashmir," issued on the 2nd October 1935.*

I thought it unfair to the All-India Kashmir Committee, of which I am the President, to reply to the letter containing the offer without giving my Committee an opportunity of expressing its opinion on it. I informed Dr. Mitra Yaqub Beg to that effect. It has been wrongly inferred from my letter by certain writers in the Press, who are probably Qadianis, that I have no objection on principle to accepting the office which was offered to me. I, therefore, hasten to make it clear that I have serious objection on principle not only to accepting the offer but even to entertaining it. My reasons for this attitude are the same as led me to suggest the reconstitution of the All-India Kashmir Committee some time ago.

The offer which has been made to me is obviously a camouflage intended to hoodwink the public into a belief that the old All-India Kashmir Committee still exists as a distinct body from the reconstituted Committee and that the gentlemen who were excluded from the reconstituted Committee are prepared to work under the leadership of the very man who was mainly responsible for the reconstitution.

This device, however, cannot convince me or the Muslim public that the reasons which led me to the reconstitution of the Kashmir Committee have disappeared. No definite declaration has yet emanated from the Qadiani headquarters that in the event of the Qadianis joining a Muslim political organisation, their allegiance will not be divided. On the other hand events have revealed that what the Qadiani Press describes as "Tehrik-i-Kashmir" and in which, according to the Qadiani newspaper *Al-Fazl*, Muslims were only courteously allowed to participate, has entirely different aims and objects from those of the All-India Kashmir Committee. Certain open letters addressed by the head of the Qadiani community to his "Kashmir brethren"—a phrase which appears to have been used in order to avoid the use of the term Muslim for non-Qadiani Kashmiris—disclosed at least some of the inner motives of this Qadiani 'Tehrik-i-Kashmir.'

In these circumstances I fail to understand how any Muslim can associate himself with a *Tehrik* which has revealed itself to be the instrument of a specific propaganda even though it seeks to cover itself with a thin veneer of non-sectarianism.



## XXI

*Statement on the administrative reforms in Kashmir,  
issued on the 3rd August 1933.*

The people of India will welcome this *communiqué*. I hope all the recommendations made by the Glancy

Commission will be carried out as soon as possible and that the Kashmir Government will succeed in inspiring complete confidence in the minds of those for whom the reforms are intended. For this purpose an atmosphere of peace and good-will is indispensable between the rulers and the ruled towards whom the Government should behave in such a manner as to make them feel that the Government is not a factor alien to their life and aspirations but an institution of their own through which their legitimate aspirations are to find expression.

I cannot help suggesting to Col. Colvin that in order to win the confidence of the people and restore happy relations between them and the Government he should order the withdrawal of criminal cases pending in Mirpur and Baramulla. This will vastly enhance the prestige of the Kashmir Administration and the European Prime Minister and take away the sting of propaganda now carried on against him.

## XXII

*Statement on the "Punjab communal formula", issued on the 14th July 1933.*

The sponsors of the formula<sup>2</sup> are alleged to have

1 Prime Minister, Kashmir, State.

2 The 'Punjab Communal Formula' was evolved by certain leaders with a view to substitute it in the Punjab for the Premier's Communal Award. Inter alia provided that (i) the franchise qualification of the three communities be so modified as to reflect the population of each community in the voting register; (ii) the electorates shall be joint and the whole province was to be divided into single-member constituencies, the division being territorial on a population basis; and (iii) the constituencies allotted to each community shall be such wherein its percentage of voters was the largest.

agreed that the occasion for Punjab Muslims to express an opinion on it would arise only when Hindus and Sikhs have agreed to it, I find that the Hindu Press is opposed to it and the Sikh leader, Master Tara Singh, has expressed his intention "to fight it tooth and nail." It is, therefore, hardly necessary for me to enter into a detailed criticism of the formula or the principles underlying it. But I should like to express my general opinion that the formula can be no solution of the Puniab problem. On the other hand, it is likely to become a source of a series of unforeseen disputes among the communities.

Howsoever the constituencies in the provinces may be reserved in order to secure the effect of the Premier's Award, the scheme will be open to serious objection from the point of view of the urban as well as the rural population. When worked out, the scheme is calculated to deprive even those rural sections of proper representation who are in a majority in their constituencies.

After having considered all its various aspects and all the possible disputes which it may create, I am firmly of the opinion that the scheme is harmful to the best interests of every community and not nearly as good from the point of view of any community as the Premier's Award.

In view of the opposition offered to the scheme by Hindus and Sikhs and in view of the fact that the motives for its Muslim sponsors, if there are any, are being misinterpreted, I earnestly appeal to the authors of the scheme to wash their hands off a formula which cannot inspire confidence in the mind of any com-

munity and refrain from introducing it in the Punjab Legislative Council.

---

## XXIII

*Statement explaining Sir Fazl-i-Husain observation in the Council of State regarding Pan-Islamic, issued on the 19th September 1933.*

Sir Fazl-i-Husain is perfectly correct when he says that political Pan-Islamism never existed. It has existed, if at all, only in the imagination of those who invented the phrase or possibly as a diplomatic weapon in the hands of Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan of Turkey. Even Jamal-ud-Din Afghani whose name is closely associated with what is called Pan-Islamic movement, never dreamed of a unification of Muslims into a political State.

It is significant that in no Islamic language—Arabic, Persian or Turkish—does there exist a phrase corresponding to Pan-Islamism.

It is, however, true that Islam as a society or as a practical scheme for the combination not only of races and nations but also of all religions does not recognise the barriers of race and nationality or geographical frontiers. In the sense of this humanitarian ideal Pan-Islamism—if one prefers to use this unnecessarily long phrase to the simple expression "Islam"—does and will always exist.

Sir Fazl-i-Husain's advice to Indian Muslims to stand on their own legs as an Indian nation is perfectly



sound and I have no doubt that Muslims fully understand and appreciate it. Indian Muslims, who happen to be a more numerous people than the Muslims of all other Asiatic countries put together, ought to consider themselves the greatest asset of Islam and should sink in their own deeper self like other Muslim nations of Asia in order to gather up their scattered sources of life and, according to Sir Fazli's advice, stand on their own legs."

---

## XXIV

*statement of the proposed Afghan University, published on the 19th October 1930.*

An educated Afghanistan will be the best friend of India. The building of a new University at Kabul and the development of the Peshawar Islamia College into another University on the western border of India will very much help in the uplift of the shrewd Afghan tribes who inhabit the country that lies between our frontier and the Afghan frontier.

His Majesty the King of Afghanistan invited us<sup>1</sup> to advise his Education Minister on matters connected with the proposed University at Kabul. We felt it our duty to respond to his call. It appears from the various publications emerging from Kabul that the younger generation of Afghans are thoroughly in earnest about modern knowledge, and its co-ordina-

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Iqbal, Sir Masud and Syed Sulaiman Nadvi.

tion with their religion and culture. The Afghans are a fine people and as Indians it is our duty to help them to advance as much as they can. There are very clear indications of the development of new consciousness in that people, and we hope we may be able to advise them on matters of education in the light of our Indian experience. Personally I believe that complete secularisation of education has not produced good results anywhere especially in Muslim lands. Nor is there any absolute system of education. Each country has its own needs and its educational problems must be discussed and solved in the light of those needs.



## XXV

*Statement of the conditions in Afghanistan, issued on the  
6th November 1933.*

The first thing which we noticed was that there is complete safety of life and property in the country. This is in itself a remarkable achievement for a Government which overcame a widespread rebellion only four years ago. Another thing which impressed us was the very earnest manner in which all the Ministers are discharging their duties. Even the orthodox party stands solidly behind these workers and consequently there is—as was stated in our presence by a leading Afghan divine—no difference between the mullas and the

<sup>1</sup> This statement was issued jointly with Sir Ross Masud and Syed Sulaiman Nadvi.

young men in the Afghanistan of today.

It is the intention of the Afghan Government to reorganise the entire department of Public Instruction on modern lines and at the same time to improve all roads which connect Afghanistan with neighbouring countries. A beautiful and commodious palace in Kabul has already been reserved for the new University which is gradually developing. Higher education is being imparted in medicine, this being the first faculty to be organised. The next faculty to be organised will be that of civil engineering. As regards the roads, a new one joining Kabul with Peshawar will be completed within the next two years. This road has been carefully planned. A road leading to Russian frontiers has already been completed and is of obvious importance as it brings Central Asia nearer to Central Europe.

We had the honour of a long interview with His Majesty the King of Afghanistan whose sole desire is to see his country flourishing and living in peace and amity with its neighbours.

Thus Afghanistan represents today a united country where in every direction one sees signs of a new awakening and where the authorities are engaged in drawing up programmes of well-planned work. We have come back from that country with a conviction that if those who are in power are given an opportunity of continuing their work for ten years, the future prosperity of Afghanistan will have been assured.

---

## XXVI

*Statement explaining the attitude of Muslim delegates to the Round Table Conferences, issued on the 6th December 1933.*

I have never had the pleasure of meeting Pandit Jawahar Lal, though I have always admired his sincerity and outspokenness. His latest statement in reply to his Mahasabहितe critics has a ring of sincerity which is rare in the pronouncements of present-day politicians in India. It seems, however, that he is not in full possession of the facts regarding the behaviour of Muslim delegates to the Round Table Conferences held in the London during the past three years.

He has been led to believe that Mr. Gandhi offered personally to accept all of the Muslim demands on condition that Muslims assured him of their full support in the political struggle for freedom and that reactionaryism rather than communalism prevented Muslims from accepting this condition. This is a perfectly wrong statement of what happened in London.

Pandit Jawahar Lal has described His Highness the Agha Khan as the greatest inspirer of political reactionaryism among Muslims. The truth, however, is that it was the Agha Khan himself who assured Mr. Gandhi in the presence of several Indian delegates, including myself, that if the Hindus or the Congress agreed to Muslim demands, the entire Muslim community would be ready to serve as his. (Mr. Gandhi's) camp-followers in the political struggle.

Mr. Gandhi weighed the Agha Khan's words and

his offer to accept Muslim demands came later and was hedged round with conditions. The first condition was that Mr. Gandhi would accept the Muslim demands in his personal capacity and would try to secure, but not guarantee, the acceptance of his position by the Congress. I asked him to wire to the Congress Executive and secure its consent to his offer. He said he knew that the Congress would not make him their plenipotentiary on the question.

Pandit Jawahar Lal Nehru can easily refer to Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, who sat near me at the time as to her observations which she shared with me on Mr. Gandhi's attitude. Mr. Gandhi was then asked to secure atleast the Hindu and Sikh delegates' consent to his offer. He did make something like an attempt to do so but failed and privately expressed his disappointment with their attitude.

Mr. Gandhi's second and most unrighteous condition was that Muslims should not support the special claims of Untouchables, particularly their claim to special representation. It was pointed out to him that it did not lie in the mouth of Muslims to oppose those very claims on the part of the Untouchables which they were advancing for themselves and that if Mr. Gandhi could arrive at a mutual understanding with the Untouchables, the Muslims would certainly not stand in their way. Mr. Gandhi, however, insisted on the condition. I should like to know how far Pandit Jawahar Lal with his well-known socialist views would sympathise with such an inhuman condition.

This is the inner history of the negotiations be-

tween Mr. Gandhi and Muslim delegates. I would leave it to Pandit Jawahar Lal to judge whether the alleged political reactionaryism among Muslim delegates or the narrow political outlook of others was responsible for the result of negotiations.

The offer which His Highness the Agha Khan made to Mr. Gandhi two years ago still holds good. If under Pandit Nehru's leadership the Hindus or the Congress agree to the safeguards which Muslims believe to be necessary for their protection as an all-India minority, the Muslims are still ready to serve, in the Agha Khan's words, as camp-followers of the majority community in the country's political struggle. If, however, he is unable to accept this offer let him at least not accuse Muslims of political reactionaryism but leave those who understand the motive and purposes of Hindu communalism to draw the conclusion that he is in essential agreement with the Mahasabha in the latter's campaign against the Communal Award.

Another accusation which Pandit Jawahar Lal brings against Muslims is that some of them are definitely anti-national. If by 'nationalism' he means a fusion of the communities in a biological sense, I should personally plead guilty to the charge of anti-nationalism. The building up of nation in this sense is, in my opinion, neither possible nor perhaps desirable in the peculiar circumstances of India. In this sense perhaps the greatest anti-national leader in India of today is Mr. Gandhi who has made it a life-mission to prevent the fusion of Untouchables with other communities and to retain them in the fold of

Hinduism without any real fusion even between them and the caste Hindus. As far as I can judge it, his message to the Untouchables amounts to this; 'Do not leave Hinduism. Remain in it without being of it.'

A man who opposes nationalism in the sense of a fusion of the communities is, however, not necessarily anti-national. It is obvious that there are interests common to the various communities of India. In so far as these interests are concerned an understanding among the communities is possible according to my belief, is bound to come. The present situation is only a necessary stage in the country's political evolution. A united India will have to be built on the foundation of concrete facts, *i.e.*, the country. The sooner Indian leaders of political thought get rid of the idea of a unitary Indian nation based on something like a biological fusion of the communities, the better for all concerned.

Pandit Jawahar Lal further seems to think that Muslims, while believing in democracy as a religious institution, are afraid of democracy in practice. He overlooks the fact that the communal electorates and other safeguards on which Muslims insist are only intended to prevent 80 million members of a comparatively poor and backward community from being ousted from all real advantages of democracy. The Muslim wants safeguards not because he is afraid of democracy but because he has reason to be afraid of communal oligarchy in the garb of democracy in India. He wants to ensure the substance of democracy even at the expense of its conventional form.

As for his reference to the speeches made by His

Highness the Agha Khan, Dr. Shafaat Ahmed and myself before a gathering of members of the House of Commons, I have only to say that the kind of statements attributed to us were never made. It is unfair to cite the impressions of a Press correspondent instead of an authorised text of our speeches in such an argument. No Indian can believe for a moment that it is impossible to govern India except through a British agency.

In conclusion I must put a straight question to Pandit Jawahar Lal. How is India's problem to be solved if the majority community will neither concede the minimum safeguards necessary for the protection of a minority of 80 million people nor accept the award of a third party; but continue to talk of a kind of nationalism which works out only to its own benefit? This position can admit of only two alternatives. Either the Indian majority community will have to accept for itself the permanent position of an agent of British imperialism in the East or the country will have to be redistributed on a basis of religious, historical and cultural affinities so as to do away with the question of electorates and the communal problem in its present form.

---

## XXVII

*Statement explaining the Congress attitude towards the Communal Award, issued on the 19th June 1934.*

The Congress claims to represent equally all the communities of India and declares that, in view of the



sharp difference of opinion in India regarding the Communal Award, it can neither accept nor reject it; yet its comments on the Award Amount to a rejection by implication. Consistently with its claim, it ought not to have expressed any opinion about the Award. The Congress Working Committee has deliberately chosen to ignore the important fact that the Award, though it has been incorporated in the White Paper, does not stand or fall with it, but stands on an entirely different footing. While the other parts of the White Paper are proposals, the Award represents a decision given by the British Premier at the request of the very men who are now opposing it.

The Congress Working Committee has tried by this resolution to hide its inner communalism, but in the very act of doing so has unveiled its designs to such an extent that no Muslim will fail to see through the game. At this critical juncture I would advise the Muslims of India to stand boldly by the Communal Award even though it does not concede all their demands. This is the only course they can adopt as a practical people.

---

## XXVIII

*Letter dated 20th July 1937 to Miss Fargherson giving his views on the Palestine Report.*

I am still and invalid and fear I cannot write to you a long letter giving you in detail my view on the Palestine Report and the strange thoughts and feelings which it has engendered or is likely to engender in the

mind of the Indian Muslims as well as the Muslims of Asia generally. I think it is time for the National League of England to rise to the occasion and to save the British people from this great injustice to Arabs to whom definite promises were given by British politicians in the name of the British people. Through wisdom alone comes power; and when power abandones the ways of wisdom and relies upon itself alone its end is death. Prince Muhammad Ali of Egypt has made a constructive suggestion which must receive consideration from the British people. We must not forget that Palestine does not belong to England. She is holding it under a mandate from the League of Nations which Muslim Asia is now learning to regard as an Anglo-French institution invented for the purpose of dividing the territories of weaker Muslim peoples. Nor does Palestine belong to the Jews who abandoned it of their own free will long before its possession by the Arabs. Nor is Zionism a religious movement. Apart from movement, the Palestine Report itself has brought out this fact in perfectly clear manner. Indeed the impression given to the unprejudiced reader is that Zionism as a movement was deliberately created not for the purpose giving a National home the Jews but mainly for the purpose of giving a home to British imperialism on the Mediterranean littoral. The Report amounts on the whole to a sale under duress to the British of the Holy Places in the shape of the permanent mandate which the Commission has invented in order to cover their imperialistic designs. The price of this sale is amount of money to the Arabs plus an appeal to their generosity and a piece of land to the Jews. I do hope that British

statesmen will abandon this policy of actual hostility to the Arabs and restore their country to them. I have no doubt that Arabs will be ready to come to an understanding with the English and if necessary with the French also. If the British people are duped by propaganda against the Arabs, I fear the consequences of the present policy will be grave.

---

## XXIX

*Statement on the Report recommending the partition of Palestine, read at a public meeting held under the auspices of the Punjab Provincial muslim League at Lahore on the 27th July 1937.*

I assure the people that I feel the injustice done to the Arabs as keenly as anybody else who understands the situation in the Near East. I have no doubt that the British people can still be awakened to the fulfilment of the pledges given to the Arabs in the name of England. The British Parliament, I am glad to say, have in the recent Parliamentary debates left the question of partition open. This decision affords an excellent opportunity to the Muslims of the world emphatically to declare that the problem which the British statesmen are tackling is not one of Palestine only, but seriously affects the entire Muslim world.

The problem, studied in its historical perspective, is purely a Muslim problem. In the light of the history of Israel, Palestine ceased to be a Jewish problem long before the entry of Caliph 'Umar into Jerusalem more than 1300 years ago. Their dispersion, as

Professor Hockings has pointed out, was perfectly voluntary and their scriptures were for the most part written outside Palestine. Nor was it ever a Christian problem. Modern historical research has doubted even the existence of Peter the Hermit. Even if we assume that the Crusades were an attempt to make Palestine a Christian problem, this attempt was defeated by the victories of Salah-ud-Din I, therefore, regard Palestine as a purely Muslim problem.

Never were the motives of British imperialism as regard the Muslim people of the Near East so completely unmasked as in the Report of the Royal Commission. The idea of a national home for the Jews in Palestine was only a device. In fact, British imperialism sought a home for itself in the form of a permanent mandate in the religious home of the Muslims. This is indeed a dangerous experiment, as a member of British Parliament has rightly described it and can never lead to a solution of the British problem in the Mediterranean. Far from being a solution of the British problem in the Mediterranean it is really the beginning of the future difficulties of British imperialism. The sale of the Holy Land including the Mosque of 'Umar, inflicted on the Arabs with the threat of martial law and softened by an appeal to their generosity, reveals bankruptcy of statesmanship rather than its achievement. The offer of a piece of rich land to the Jews and the rocky desert plus cash to the Arabs is no political wisdom. It is a law transaction unworthy and damaging to the honour of a great people in whose name definite promises of liberty and confederation were given to

the Arabs.

It is impossible for me to discuss the details of the Palestine Report in this short statement. There are, however, in recent history, important lessons which Muslims of Asia ought to take to heart. Experience has made it abundantly clear that the political integrity of the peoples of the Near East lies in the immediate reunion of the Turks and the Arabs. The policy of isolating the Turks from the rest of the Muslim world is still in action. We hear now and then that the Turks are repudiating Islam. A greater lie was never told. Only those who have no idea of the history of the concepts of Islamic jurisprudence fall an easy prey to this sort of mischievous propaganda.

The Arabs, whose religious consciousness gave birth to Islam (which united the various races of Asia with remarkable success), must never forget the consequences arising out of their deserting the Turks in their hour of trial.

Secondly, the Arab people must further remember that they cannot afford to rely on the advice of those Arab kings who are not in a position to arrive at an independent judgment in the matter of Palestine with an independent conscience. Whatever they decide they should decide on their own initiative after a full understanding of the problem before them.

Thirdly, the present moment is also a moment of trial for the Muslim statesmen of the free non-Arab muslim countries of Asia since the obliteration of the Caliphate this is the first serious international problem of both a religious and political nature which historical forces are compelling them

to face. The possibilities of the Palestine problem may eventually compel them seriously to consider their position as members of that Anglo-French institution mis-called the League of Nations and to explore practical means for the formation of an Eastern League of Nations.

---

## XXX

*Letter dated 6th September 1937 to Miss Farquharson on the subject of Palestine.*

...I am very glad to see that the National League is taking keen interest in the matter of Palestine and I have no doubt that the League will eventually succeed in making the British people realize the true meaning of the situation and the political consequences which may follow in case Britain loses the friendship of Arabs. I have been more or less in touch with Egypt, Syria and Iraq. I also received letters from Najaf. You must have read that the Shaias of Kerbala and Najaf have made a strong protest against the partition of Palestine. The Persian Prime Minister and the president of Turkish Republic have also spoken and protested. In India too the feeling is rapidly growing more and more intense.

The other day 50,000 Muslims met at Delhi and protested against the Palestine Commission. It is further reported in the press that some Muslims have been arrested in Cawnpore in connection with Palestine question. It is now perfectly clear that the entire Muslim world is united on this question....I have every

reason to believe that the National League will save England from a grave political blunder and in so doing it will serve both England and the Muslim world.....

---

### XXXI

*Statement urging the creation of a chair for Islamic research, published on the 10th December 1937.*

I am very grateful to Sir Sikandar Hyat Khan for the many kind things he has said of me in this message the Inter-Collegiate, Muslim Brotherhood, Lahore.

I wish, however, to say a few words regarding his proposal that my readers and others interested in my work should present a purse to me. I feel that the needs of the people as a whole are far more pressing than the needs of a private individual even though his work may have been a source of inspiration to most people. The individual and his needs pass away: the people and their needs remain.

The creation of a chair for Islamic research on modern lines in the local Islamic College is the crying need of the country. Nowhere in India has the ignorance of Islamic history, theology, jurisprudence and Sufism been so successfully exploited as in the Punjab.

It is high time to show to the people by a careful genetic study of Islamic thought and life what the faith really stands for and how its main ideas and problems have been stifled under the pressure of a head crust which has grown over the conscience of modern Indian

muslim. This crust demands immediate removal so that the conscience of the younger generation may find a free and natural expression.

Even now Muslims will find much of interest in this institution, for Islam is and has been a very important phase in the life of Asiatic peoples and has played a great role in the religious and intellectual evolution of mankind.

I do hope this will meet the Premier's approval and his influence will make this proposal a success. I offer a humble contribution of Rs. 100 to the fund.

---

## XXXII

*New Year message broadcast from the Lahore Station of the All-India Radio on the 1st January 1938:*

The modern age prides itself on its progress in knowledge and its matchless scientific developments. No doubt, the pride is justified. Today space and time are being annihilated and man is achieving amazing successes in unveiling the secrets of nature and harnessing its forces to his own service. But in spite of all these developments, the tyranny of imperialism struts abroad, covering its face in the masks of Democracy, Nationalism, Communism, Fascism and heaven knows what else besides. Under these masks, in every corner of the earth, the spirit of freedom and the dignity of man are being trampled underfoot in a way of which not even the darkest period of human history presents a parallel. The so-called statesmen to whom government and leadership of man was en-



trusted have proved demons bloodshed, tyranny and oppression. The rulers whose duty it was to higher humanity, to prevent man's oppression of man and to elevate the moral and intellectual level of mankind, have, in their hunger for dominion and imperial possessions, shed the blood of millions and reduced millions to servitude simply in order to pander to the greed and avarice of their own particular groups. After subjugating and establishing their dominion over weaker peoples, they have robbed them of their possessions, of their religions, their morals, of their cultural traditions and their literatures. Then they sowed divisions among them that they should shed one another's blood and go to sleep under the opiate of serfdom, so that the leech of imperialism might go on sucking their blood without interruption.

As I look back on the year that has passed and as I look at the world in the midst of the New Year's rejoicings, it may be Abyssinia or Palestine, Spain or China, the same misery prevails in every corner of man's earthly home, and hundreds of thousands of men are being butchered mercilessly. Engines of destruction created by science are wiping out the great landmarks of man's cultural achievements. The governments which are not themselves engaged in this drama of fire and blood are sucking the blood of the weaker

[The references here are to Italy's invasion of Abyssinia, the unrest in Palestine resulting from the Peel Commission's recommendation to Partition Palestine, Civil War in Spain and the invasion of China by Japan.]

peoples economically. It is as if the day of doom had come upon the earth, in which each looks after the safety of his own skin, and in which no voice of human sympathy or fellowship is audible.

The world's thinkers are stricken dumb. Is this going to be the end of all this progress and evolution of civilization, they ask, that men should destroy one another in mutual hatred and make human habitation impossible on this earth? Remember, man can be maintained on this earth only by honouring mankind, and this world will remain a battle-ground of ferocious beasts of prey unless and until the educational forces of the whole world are directed to inculcating in man respect for mankind. Do you not see that the people of Spain, though they have the same common bond of one race, one nationality, one language and one religion, are cutting one another's throats and destroying their culture and civilization by their own hands owing to a difference in their economic creed? This one event shows clearly that national unity too is not a very durable force. Only one unity is dependable and that unity is the brotherhood of man, which is above race, nationality, colour or language. So long as this so-called democracy, this accursed nationalism and this degraded imperialism are not shattered, so long as men do not demonstrate by their actions that they believe that the whole world is the family of God, so long as distinctions of race, colour and geographical nationalities are not wiped out completely, they will never be able to lead a happy and contented life and the beautiful ideals of liberty, equality and fraternity will never materialise.

Let us therefore begin the New Year with the prayer that God Almighty may grant humanity to those who are in places of power and government and teach them to cherish mankind.

### XXXIII

*Statement on Islam and Nationalism in reply to a Statement of Maulana Hussain Ahmed published in "Ehsan" on the 5th March 1938.*

In my verse

سرود ہر سرِ منبر کہ ملت از وطن است  
چہ ہے خبر از مقامِ معبدِ عربی است

I have used the word "millat" in the sense of "qaum" (nation). No doubt, the word "millat" has been used to mean law and religion in Arabic, and especially in the Holy Quran, but there exists in modern Arabic, Iranian and Turkish languages considerable evidence to show that the word "millat" is also used in the sense of nation. In my writings I have generally used the word in the latter sense. But in view of the fact that the meaning of the word "millat" does not, to any extent, affect the issues under consideration, I, leaving aside this controversy altogether, take it that Maulana Hussain Ahmed said that nations are formed by lands. As a matter of fact I have nothing to say even against this statement of the Maulana. Objection must, however, be raised when it is contended that in modern times nations are formed by lands and the Indian Muslims are advised to accept this view. Such advice brings before our minds the Western modern conception of nationalism, to one aspect of which it is absolutely essential for a Muslim to take exception. It is a pity that my objec-

tion has led the Maulana to think that what I had in mind was to propagate the cause of some political party. Far from it, I have been repudiating the concept of nationalism since the time when it was not well known in India and the Muslim world. At the very start it had become clear to me from the writings of European authors that the imperialistic designs of Europe were in great need of this effective weapon—the propagation of the European conception of nationalism in Muslim countries—to shatter the religious unity of Islam to pieces. And the plan did succeed during the Great War. It has now reached its climax inasmuch as some of the religious leader in India lend their support to this conception. Strange, indeed, are the vicissitudes of time. Formerly, the half-Westernized educated Muslims were under the spell of Europe: now the curse has descended upon religious leaders. Perhaps modern conceptions of Europe seem attractive to them but alas!

تو نه گردد کعبه را رخت حیات  
کز افروغ آیدش لات و صلات

I have just said that the Maulana's statement that nations are formed by lands is not open to objection. This is so because from remote "past nations have been associated with countries and countries with nations. We are all Indians and are so called because we live in that part of the world which is known by the name of India. So with the Chinese, the Arabs, the Japanese, the Iranians, etc. The word "country" used in this statement is merely a geographical term and as such, does not clash with Islam. Its boundaries change with time. Till recently those living in Burma

were Indians: at present they are Burmese. In this sense every human being loves the land of his birth, and according to his capacity remains prepared to make sacrifices for it. Some unthinking persons support this by the saying حب الوطن من الإيمان which they think is a tradition of the Prophet, but this is hardly necessary. Love of one's native land is a natural instinct and requires no impressions to nourish it. In the present-day political literature, however, the idea of nation is not merely geographical: it is rather a principle of human society and as such it is a political concept. Since Islam also is a law of human society, the word "country", when used as a political concept, comes into conflict with Islam. No one else knows it better than Maulana Hussain Ahmad that in its principles of human association Islam admits of no *modus vivendi* and is not prepared to compromise with any other law regulating human society. Indeed it declares that every code of law other than that of Islam is inadequate and unacceptable. This principle raises some political controversies closely connected with India. For instance, cannot the Muslims live in unity with other nations? Cannot the various nations and communities unite for serving the country's ends and so on and so forth? I must, however, perforce, leave these questions aside because at the moment my object is to criticise only the religious aspect of the Maulana's statement.

Besides rational arguments, experience also proves the truth of the above-mentioned claim of Islam.

Love of one's native country is a part of one's faith.

First, if the purpose of human society is to ensure peace and security for the nations and to transform their present social organism into a single social order, then one cannot think of any other social order than that of Islam. This is so because, according to my reading of the Quran, Islam does not aim at the moral reformation of the individual alone; it also aims at a gradual but fundamental revolution in the social life of mankind, which should altogether change its national and racial view-point and create in its place a purely human consciousness. The history of religions conclusively show that in ancient times religion was national as in the case of Egyptians, Greeks and Iranians. Later on, it became racial as that of the Jews. Christianity taught that religion is an individual and private affair. Religion having become synonymous with private beliefs, Europe began to think that the State alone was responsible for the social life of man. It was Islam and Islam alone which, for the first time, gave the message to mankind that religion was neither national and racial, nor individual and private, but purely human and that its purpose was to unite and organise mankind despite all its natural distinctions. Such a system cannot be built on beliefs alone. And this is the only way in which harmony and concord can be introduced in the sentiments and thoughts of mankind. This harmony is essential for the formation and preservation of a community. How beautifully sings Maulana Rumi :

ہم دلی لڑ ہم زبانی بہتر است

Any other way will be irreligious and contrary to human dignity. The example of Europe is before the world. When the religious unity of Europe got shattered and the nations of that continent became disunited, Europeans began to search for the basis of national life. Obviously, Christianity could not be such a basis. The Europeans found this basis in the idea of nationality. But what has been the end of their choice? The reformation of Luther, the period of unsound rationalism, and separation—indeed war—between the principles of religion and state. Where did these forces drive Europe to? To irreligiousness, religious scepticism and economic conflicts. Does Maulana Husain Ahmad desire that the experiment should be repeated in Asia? The Maulana thinks that in the present-day world laud is the necessary basis of a nation. No doubt, this is the general feeling these days, but it is also evident that this basis is by itself inadequate. There are a number of other forces also which are necessary for the formation of a nation. For instance, indifference towards religion, absorption in the day to day political issues, and so on. Besides, there are also other factors which statesmen think out for themselves as means for maintaining unity and harmony in that nation. The Maulana ignores the fact that if such a nation comprises different religions and communities, the communities generally die away and the only common factor that remains in the individuals of that nation is irreligiousness. Not even a layman, let alone religious leaders, who thinks that religion is necessary factor for human life, desires that such a state of affairs should be brought about

in India. So far as the Muslims are concerned, it is a pity that, simple-minded as they are, they are not fully aware of the consequences of this view of nationalism. If some Muslims have fallen into the error that religion and nationalism can go hand in hand as a political concept, then I want to give a timely warning to the Muslims that this course will ultimately lead to irreligiousness. And if this does not happen, Islam will be reduced to an ethical ideal with indifference to its social order as an inevitable consequence.

But the mischief latent in Maulana Husain Ahmad's statement demands closer examination. therefore, hope that readers will peruse the following lines carefully. Maulana Husain Ahmad is a learned divine: he cannot, therefore, be unaware of the dangerous consequences of the view he has set forth for the followers of Muhammad. Whether he has used the word "qaum" or "millat" is immaterial. To use a word for a party which, according to him consists of the followers of Muhammad and to say that land forms the basis of that party is very regrettable and unfortunate. It appears from his statement that he does feel conscious of his mistake, but not to the extent which should lead to its admission or rectification. A purely verbal and philologica argument is mere quibbling. And a philological distinction between *millat* and *qaum* is no consolation. The distinction may perhaps console those who are unaware of the truths of the faith of Islam. Surely, this statement cannot deceive those who are in the know of things.

The Maulana has not realized that by offering



his interpretation he has put before the Muslims two wrong and dangerous views. First, that the Muslims—as a nation can be other than what they are as a *millat*. Secondly, because as a nation they happen to be Indians, they should, leaving aside their faith, lose their identity in the nationality of other Indian nations or in “Indianism.” It is merely quibbling on the words *qawm* and *millat*. Otherwise the view is the same that has been described above and which the major community in this country and its leaders are every day persuading the Indian Muslims to adopt, viz., that religion and politics are entirely separate, and if the Muslims want to live in this country, they must understand religion to be a merely private affair which should be confined to individuals alone. Politically they should not regard themselves as a separate nation: they should rather lose themselves in the majority.

By saying that he has not used the word “*millat*” in his speech, the Maulana seems to pretend that he regards *millat* as something ‘higher than nation. “There is”, he says, “a world of difference between the two, and if the nation be compared to the earth, *millat* is like heaven.” In actual practice, however, he has left no place for *millat* by preaching to the eight crore Muslims to lose their identity in the country, and therefore in the majority and to make nation a heaven and to ignore the fact that Islam will thereby be reduced to the status of the earth.

By supposing that I was unaware of the difference between the meanings of *qawm* and *millat* and that before writing the verse I had neither examined the

Press report of the Maulana's speech nor looked up the *Qamus*, the Maulana has charged me with ignorance of the Arabic language. I welcome the charge. It would, however, have been better if the Maulana had, if not for me, at least for the sake of the Muslim community, passed beyond the *Qamus* and referred to the Quran and before placing this dangerous and un-Islamic view before the Muslims had consulted the holy revelation sent by God. I admit that I am neither a learned divine nor a litterateur in Arabic :

فلذہ جز نہ حرف لالہ کچھ فی نہیں رکھتا  
مقم شہر فاروق ۽ لغت عالیہ حجازی کا

But why was the Maulana content with the *Qamus* alone? Has not the word "qaum" been used hundreds of times in the Quran? And has not the word "millat" occurred repeatedly in the Quran? What do *qaum* and *millat* mean in the Quranic verses? Is not the word "ummat" also used in addition to these two words to denote the followers of the Prophet? Are these words so divergent in meaning that because of this difference one single nation can have different aspects, so much so that in matters of religion and law, it should observe the divine code, while from the view-point of nationality it should follow a system which may be opposed to the religious system?

Had the Maulana sought evidence from the Quran, I am confident, the solution of this problem would have automatically suggested itself to him. The philological meaning of the words given by the Maulana is to a great extent correct. "Qaum"

literally means "a group of persons excluding women." Philologically, then, women are not included in *qaum*. But it is obvious that when the Holy Quran makes mention of the *qaum* of Musa and the *qaum* of 'Ad, women are included in *qaum*. *Millat* also means religion and law. But the question is not one of difference between the dictionary meanings of the two words. The real question is this: First, are Muslims collectively a single, united and definite party founded on the Unity of God and the Finality of Prophethood as its basis, or are they a party which owing to the requirements of race, nation and colour can, leaving aside their religious unity, adopt some other social order based upon a different system and law? Secondly, has the Quran ever employed the word "*qaum*" to denote this idea? Or does it use the words "*ummat*" or "*millat*" only? Thirdly, which word does the divine revelation employ in this connection? Does any Quranic verse say, "O ye people!", or 'O ye faithful! join the *qaum* of Muslims or follow it'? Or is the call to follow the *millat* and to join the *ummat*?

So far as I have been able to understand, wherever the Quran calls upon the people to follow and join the Muslim party, the word "*millat*" or "*ummat*" is used. There is no call to follow or join any particular nation. For instance, the Quran says :

وَمَنْ أَحْسَنُ دِينًا مِّنْ أَسْلَمَ وَجْهَهُ ۖ إِلَهُهُ وَهُوَ مُحْسِنٌ وَاتَّبَعَ مِلَّةَ  
 إِبْرَاهِيمَ حَنِيفًا

Who is better in religion than he who surrenders his purpose to Allah while doing good (to men) and followeth the *millat* of Abraham, the upright, (IV : 125)

The call is to obey and to follow *millat* because *millat* stands for a religion, a law and a programme. As *qaum* is no law or religion, it was of no use calling upon people to follow and to adhere to it. A group, whether it be a tribe or a race, a band of dacoits or a company of business men, the dwellers of a city or the inhabitants of a country, as a geographical unit is a mere group either of men or of both men and women. From the view-point of divine revelation and of a Prophet, this group is not yet a guided one. If revelation to a Prophet appears in this group, it will be the first to be addressed and it is for this reason associated with it, *e. g.* *qaum* of Noah, *qaum* of Moses and *qaum* of Lot. If, on the contrary, this group instead of the following a Prophet follows a king or a chief, it will be attributable to him also, *e. g.* the *qaum* of 'Ad, the *qaum* of Pharaoh. If two groups happen to live in one country and if they follow mutually opposed leaders, they can still be associated with both the leaders; for instance, the *qaum* of Moses lived side by side with the *qaum* of Pharaoh:

قال الملأ من قوم فرعون انذر موسى وقومه ليفسدوا في الارض

But wherever the word "qaum" occurs, it is used to mean a 'group including both the guided and un-guided. Those who followed the Prophet, professed the Unity of God, became part and parcel of the

The chief of Pharaoh's people said, "(O king!), wilt thou suffer Moses and his people to make mischief in the land?" (VII: 127).

*millat* of that Prophet and his religion. In plainer language, they became Muslims. It must be remembered that the unbelievers can also have a faith and *millat*.

انى تركت مله قوم لا يؤمنون بالله

A *qaum* can have a *millat* or a particular way of life. The *millat* of a *qaum*, on the other hand, has nowhere been used. This means that, in the Quran, God has used the word "millat" and not "qaum" for those persons who after renouncing different *qaums* and *millats* embraced the *millat* of Abraham.

What I have said above means that, so far as I have been able to see, no other word except *ummat* has been used for Muslims in the Holy Quran. If it is otherwise, I would very much like to know it. *Qaum* means a party of men, and this party can come into being in a thousand places and in a thousand forms upon the basis of tribe, race, colour, language, land and ethical code. *Millat*, on the contrary, will carve out of the different parties a new and common party. In other words, *millat* or *ummat* embraces nations but cannot be merged in them.

Circumstances have forced the present-day 'ulama to say things and interpret the Quran in a way which could never have been the intention of the Prophet and the Quran. Who does not know that Abraham was the first Prophet in whose revelation the distinctions of nations, races and lands were set aside?

٢٤٥; I have fore-taken the religion of a people who do not believe in God. (XII : 37).

Humanity was divided into two classes only—monotheists and polytheists. Since then there are only two *ummats* in the world, without a third. The guardians of the Kaaba have today neglected the call of Abraham and Ishmael. Those who have put on the garb of nationalism do not think of that prayer of the founders of this *millet* which the two Prophets uttered when laying the foundation of Kabba :

وَإِذْ يَرْفَعُ إِبْرَاهِيمُ الْقَوَاعِدَ مِنَ الْبَيْتِ وَإِسْمَاعِيلُ -  
 رَبَّنَا تَقَبَّلْ مِنَّا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ السَّمِيعُ الْعَلِيمُ -  
 رَبَّنَا وَاجْعَلْنَا مُسْلِمَيْنِ لَكَ وَمِنْ ذُرِّيَّتِنَا أُمَّةً مُسْلِمَةً لَكَ ۗ

After getting the name of *ummat-Muslimah* from the Court of God was there any room left for merging part of the form of our society into some Arabian, Iranian, Afghani, English, Egyptian or Indian nationality ? There is only one *millet* confronting the Muslim community, that of the non-Muslims taken collectively.

The name of the faith which the Muslim community professes is "din-i-qayyim", in which term lies concealed a remarkable Quranic point, namely, that it is this religion alone in which is vested the responsibility of sustaining the present and future life of a group of people which surrenders its individual and social life to its system. In other words, accord-

1And when Abraham and Ismael were raising the foundations of the House; (Abraham prayed): Our Lord; accept from us (this duty). Thou, only Thou, art the Hearer, the Knower Our Lord; And make us submissive unto Thee and of our seed a nation submissive unto Thee (II : 127-8)

ing to the Quran, it is the religion of Islam alone which sustains a nation in its true cultural or political sense. It is for this reason that the Quran openly declares that any system other than that of Islam must be deprecated and rejected.

There is another subtle point which the Muslims must ponder over. If the sentiment of nationalism was so important and valuable, why then did some of the people of his own family, race and land rise up against the Holy Prophet (God's blessings be upon him)? Why did the Prophet not regard Islam as an all-embracing *millat* and from the view-point of nation or nationalism continue to own and encourage Abu Jahl and Abu Lahab? Indeed, why did he not keep the bond of national affinity with them in the political affairs of Arabia? If Islam stood for complete independence, the Quraish of Mecca had the same ideal before them. It is unfortunate that the Maulana does not consider the fact that the Messenger of God was concerned with the freedom of the upright faith of Islam and the Muslim community. To ignore the Muslims or to make them subservient to some other social order and then to seek some other kind of freedom was simple meaningless. The Prophet had to wage defensive war against Abu Jahl and Abu Lahab because they could not tolerate Islam flourishing in freedom.

Before his call to prophethood, the nation of Muhammad (peace be upon him) was no doubt a nation and a free one, but as Muhammad's *ummat* began to be formed, the status of the people as a nation became a secondary one. Those who accepted

Muhammad's leadership, became part and parcel of the Muslim or Muhammdan community irrespective of the fact whether they belonged to his own nation or other nations. Formerly they had been slaves of land and race : land and race now became their slaves :

کسے کم پیغم زد ملک و نسب را  
 نداند فکرم دین عرب را  
 اگر قوم از وطن بودے - محمد  
 ندادے دعوت دین بولہب را

It was a very easy course for Muhammad to tell Abu Lahab, Abu Jahl, or the Unbelievers of Mecca that they could stick to their idol-worship while he himself would hold fast to the worship of God and that they could together form an Arabian unity by virtue of the factors of race and land common to them both. God forbid, but if he had adopted this course, it would certainly have done him credit as a patriot but not as the last Prophet. The ultimate purpose of the prophetic mission of Muhammad (may peace be upon him) is to create a form of society, the constitution of which follows that divine law which the Prophet Muhammad received from God. In other words, the object is to purify the nations of the world of the abuses which go by the name of time, place, land, nation, race, genealogy, country, etc, although the differences of nations, tribes, colours and languages are at the same time acknowledged. It is thus to bestow upon man that spiritual idea which at every moment of his life remains in constant contact with Eternity. This is where Muhammad stands and this



is the ideal of the muslim community. How many centuries will take it man to reach these heights, none can say, but there is no doubt that in removing the material differences between the nations of the world and in bringing about harmony among them in spite of their differences of nations tribes, races, colours and languages, Islam has done something in thirteen hundred years what other religion could not do in three thousand years. Take it from me that the religion of Islam is an imperceptible and unfeeling biologicico-psychological activity which is capable of influencing the thoughts and actions of mankind without any missionary effort. To invalidate such an activity by the innovations of present-day political thinkers is to do violence to mankind as well as to the universality of that prophetic mission which gave birth to it.

That part of Maulana Husain Ahmad's statement in which he has asked the Editor of the *Ehsan* to produce an authority in support of the view that the *millat* of Islam is founded upon human dignity and brotherhood, must surprise many Muslims. To me misfortune, error too never comes alone. When a Muslim's mind and heart are overpowered by that idea of nationalism which the Maulana is preaching, then it is inevitable that various kinds of doubts should arise in his mind concerning the foundation of Islam. From nationalism thoughts naturally move towards the idea that mankind has been so sharply divided into nations that it is impossible to bring about unity among them. This second error which arises from nationalism gives birth to the conception of the

relativity of religions, i.e. the religion of a land belongs to that land alone and does not suit the temperaments of other nations. This third error must inevitably lead to irreligiosity and scepticism.

This is the psychological analysis of that unfortunate Muslim who becomes a victim of spiritual paralysis. So far as the question of authority is concerned, the whole of the Quran is an authoritative verdict for it. There should be no misunderstanding about the words "dignity of man." In Islamic thought these words mean that higher reality which has been vested in the heart and conscience of man, i. e. his inner structure derives itself from the immutable divine law, and that his dignity depends for its continuance and preservation upon that yearning for the Unity of God which permeates his whole being.

The history of man is an infinite process of mutual conflicts, sanguine battles and civil wars. In these circumstances can we have among mankind a constitution, the social life of which is based upon peace and security? The Quran's answer is: Yes, provided man takes for his ideal the propagation of the Unity of God in the thoughts and actions of mankind. The search for such an ideal and its maintenance is no miracle of political manoeuvring: it is a peculiar greatness of the Holy Prophet that the self-invented distinctions and superiority complexes of the nations of the world are destroyed and there comes into being a community which can be styled *أمة مسلمة* and to whose thoughts and actions the divine dictate *شهادة على الناس* justly applies.

The truth is that in the mind of Maulana Husain Ahmad and others who think like him, the conception of nationalism in a way has the same place which the rejection of the Finality of the Holy Prophet has in the minds of Qadianis. The upholders of the idea of nationalism, in other words, say that, in view of the present-day needs, it is necessary for the Muslim community to take up a position in addition to what the divine law has prescribed and defined for them for all time to come in the same way in which the Qadiani view, by inventing a new prophethood, directs the Qadiani thought into a channel which ultimately leads to the denial of the perfection and consummation of prophethood in Muhammad. *Prima facie* nationalism is political concept while the Qadiani denial of the Finality of Muhammad is a theological question, but between the two there exists a deep inner relationship which can be clearly demonstrated only when a Muslim historian gifted with acute insight compiles a history of Indian Muslims with particular reference to the religious thought of some of their apparently energetic sects.

Let me conclude this article by quoting two verses from Khagani in which he has addressed his contemporary Muslim thinkers who thought that perfection of knowledge consisted in interpreting the truths of Islam in the light of Greek philosophy. With a little change in meaning these verses aptly describe the present-day Muslim political thinkers:

مرکب دین کہ را ده عرب است دلیغ یونانی  
مشتی اطفال نو تعلیم را لوح ادبار در بغل منهد

relativity of religions, i.e. the religion of a land belongs to that land alone and does not suit the temperaments of other nations. This third error must inevitably lead to irreligiosity and scepticism.

This is the psychological analysis of that unfortunate Muslim who becomes a victim of spiritual paralysis. So far as the question of authority is concerned, the whole of the Quran is an authoritative verdict for it. There should be no misunderstanding about the words "dignity of man." In Islamic thought these words mean that higher reality which has been vested in the heart and conscience of man, i. e. his inner structure derives itself from the immutable divine law, and that his dignity depends for its continuance and preservation upon that yearning for the Unity of God which permeates his whole being.

The history of man is an infinite process of mutual conflicts, sanguine battles and civil wars. In these circumstances can we have among mankind a constitution, the social life of which is based upon peace and security? The Quran's answer is: Yes, provided man takes for his ideal the propagation of the Unity of God in the thoughts and actions of mankind. The search for such an ideal and its maintenance is no miracle of political manoeuvring: it is a peculiar greatness of the Holy Prophet that the self-invented distinctions and superiority complexes of the nations of the world are destroyed and there comes into being a community which can be styled *أمة ملة لله* and to whose thoughts and actions the divine dictate *شهدا على الناس* justly applies.

The truth is that in the mind of Maulana Husain Ahmad and others who think like him, the conception of nationalism in a way has the same place which the rejection of the Finality of the Holy Prophet has in the minds of Qadianis. The upholders of the idea of nationalism, in other words, say that, in view of the present-day needs, it is necessary for the Muslim community to take up a position in addition to what the divine law has prescribed and defined for them for all time to come in the same way in which the Qadiani view, by inventing a new prophethood, directs the Qadiani thought into a channel which ultimately leads to the denial of the perfection and consummation of prophethood in Muhammad. *Prima facie* nationalism is political concept while the Qadiani denial of the Finality of Muhammad is a theological question, but between the two there exists a deep inner relationship which can be clearly demonstrated only when a Muslim historian gifted with acute insight compiles a history of Indian Muslims with particular reference to the religious thought of some of their apparently energetic sects.

Let me conclude this article by quoting two verses from Khaqani in which he has addressed his contemporary Muslim thinkers who thought that perfection of knowledge consisted in interpreting the truths of Islam in the light of Greek philosophy. With a little change in meaning these verses aptly describe the present-day Muslim political thinkers:

مرکب دین کہ را در عرب است داغ یونانی بر کفل منہد  
 مشنہ اطفال نو تعلیم را لوح ادبار در بغل منہد